

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1855.

ART. I.—1. *A Memoir of the Rev. Sydney Smith. By his Daughter, LADY HOLLAND.* London: Longmans. 1855.

2. *The Works of the Rev. Sydney Smith.* London: Longmans.

WE are not of those who can depreciate all written examples of Sydney Smith's wit and humour by comparison with their spoken effect. We have no experience of the glories of Holland House, the great scene of his social triumphs, of the intellectual fascinations of that charmed circle, whose boast it was to make men forget there were such things as care and sorrow in the delight of the present hour. We have not even seen or heard him in his other more accessible scene of display, the pulpit of S. Paul's. Though his name has been a household word—familiar to us, since we could read a newspaper, as a sayer and writer of clever things—our knowledge of his history has been confined to his changes of residence from Yorkshire to Bristol and London; and until the publication of the present Memoir, this very limited knowledge must have been shared by many of our readers. He has been a mere wandering voice to most of us; his sphere of public action, and the society amongst whom his more actuating principles led him, being, in fact, very far removed from the knowledge and sympathy of quiet, plain Church people of all parties.

We believe that all who have had only this superficial impression of his character, not unjustly formed from such materials as they did possess, will read his daughter's memoir of him with pleasant surprise—pleasant because it is a great satisfaction to find that the most eminent example of English wit in our own time maintained his perennial flow of genial humour, not under the constant excitement of society and dissipation, as wits are popularly supposed to do, but in the discharge of such duties as he recognised; and this often under most uncongenial circumstances. A daughter's enthusiastic, and partial affection

is itself a testimony which all wits and diners-out have not won for themselves; and when it is added, that her task has been one of double duty, fulfilled in obedience to her mother's earnest injunctions, whose last wish was that her husband's history should be known, and the character she had admired and loved through life be exhibited to the world, the family witness to his domestic and private good qualities is complete. That we do not form the same high estimate need hardly be stated; but it cannot be denied that a character stands in a wholly different moral position which in the main acts up to its own standard of duty, however far removed from the highest, from another which disregards such considerations altogether, and habitually sacrifices its own notions of right to profit or to pleasure. To those who have hitherto judged Sydney Smith by the chosen companions of his social hours, and the tenor of such of his writings as are most opposed to his clerical profession, we believe the present Memoir will perform the good office of promoting him in their estimation from the latter up to the former class.

It is common to find great talents counterbalanced by as large deficiencies; and one large deficiency, no doubt fostered by the exercise of the intellect in one direction, we think very apparent in the character before us.

In many minds there is conspicuous a certain spiritual element, which in spite of appearances must be called a merely natural quality, and no more a Christian grace than a poetical temperament or a lively imagination; indeed, characters possessing it are often marked by a more than ordinary moral weakness and infirmity of purpose. This quality, when allied to true Christian principle—nature, as it were, assisting grace—forms the highest, most beautiful, and attractive picture of religion man can witness: but religion of some sort is absolutely necessary to minds so constituted. They are perpetually seeking affinity with the unseen, with something above and beyond themselves. Everything great and beautiful in nature is sought and prized as furnishing food to those desires. The invisible is to them the highest reality; all speculations, questions, and doctrines upon it, the most important as well as the most natural occupation for the understanding. Even while a prey to low desires, and victims to the most unworthy temptations, this world is not enough for them: they hope and long for something higher and better. In direct opposition to this class of minds is another form of character, in which this spiritual quality seems to be omitted altogether. Even under the influence of undoubted religious principle, we can recognise in them no flights beyond actual present things. Many regions of thought are closed to them; many motives of action are

unintelligible (unless by the light of grace); the glorious things of nature have to them no hidden meaning; they cannot sympathise with, because they do not understand, spiritual aspirations and yearnings. They are satisfied with things as they exist; or at most they desire to mend this world: they do not realize its emptiness; they do not set their hearts on another. But in compensation, may we say, they are gifted with a conscience active, clear, and just, within their own circumscribed range of vision. They feel in themselves a sense of duty restraining and controlling them. They obey this inner voice, and suffer contrition when they transgress its dictates. They understand their own social position, and own the claims of others upon them. Justice and kindness in the whole range of relative duties are their doctrines. They recognise God not through their feelings, their affections, or in the wants of an unsatisfied nature, but by the moral law He has written in their hearts; and it is only through the visible scene in which He has placed them that they aim at performing any service. 'Set your affections on things above, and not on things of the earth,' is a precept not only beyond their practice, but beyond their sympathy and comprehension. Of course, moral causes for which a man is responsible conduce, in almost every instance, to this obtuseness of feeling towards spiritual things; but our aim is to show that men also differ intellectually in their natural powers of apprehending them.

Sydney Smith was one of this class, and we believe his whole course of thought and action may be traced to the influence of the characteristics we have described. His keen love of justice made his pen an invaluable weapon against many social and legal abuses. The same sense of justice, aided of course by political bias, led him to take up the cause of the Roman Catholics. He could realize the hardship of exclusion from office and power, while all abstract questions of doctrine and belief were to his inmost mind immaterial—not that he would quite have owned this, but the injustice of civil disabilities filled his mind and excited his passions, while questions of doctrine never found their way to his intellect, or warmed his heart. He could affect a knowledge of them, indeed, to give point to a sentence; he could take the trouble to question them, where they stirred men's passions and disturbed the still waters of social life; but he never believed them of real importance between man and his Maker. And the same in the case of the Church. Religion, as we have said, when viewed as a disturber of political order, he could take no part with. He actually objected to Missions in India on this ground; but the Church, if it meant only a respectable establishment, he could throw his

heart into; he even upheld its abuses, and honestly thought himself a good Churchman for so doing. As a social system, as a body of educated men in easy circumstances, civilizing and refining the country, the Church met his sympathies—as a dogmatic teacher, asserting itself to be right, and others who opposed it wrong, he knew not whether most to ridicule or to recoil from its claims. The direction of a mind so constituted to such subjects was in some sort a necessity rather than choice. With an ambition for distinction, and a consciousness of his own powers, he was forced into the Church by his father against his will; that is, the means were withheld for pursuing the law, which was the profession he preferred, and for which his talents no doubt adapted him, and he believed no other course to be left open to him. He was not one to recognise the necessity of a call or vocation; he violated no sense of duty apparently in acting upon his father's wishes. He uniformly treats the clerical profession as a means of living; he had never any reserves about getting what good things he could, and treated canonries, prebendaries, and bishoprics as the legitimate rewards for political services; nor ever assumes a higher tone towards his sacred calling than is consistent with this prevailing line. But he did not therefore act as many a man of higher theoretical views would have done under the circumstances; he did not neglect the duties he had unwillingly entered upon, because they were uncongenial. Such as he owned to he performed really creditably, and gave his heart and mind to them, infusing into all he did the spirit and vigour of his most spirited and vigorous character. The events of his life were few, and of themselves sufficiently common-place, and probably by this time known to many of our readers; yet it is necessary briefly to recapitulate them.

Sydney Smith was born in 1771, the second of four brothers and one sister; all, it is said, remarkable for their talents, but especially the two eldest. His father was a man of some fortune and considerable cleverness, neither of which gifts he used with much discretion; for he wasted his money in restless changes of residence, and affected eccentricities of which a wise man would be ashamed. His mother, Miss Olier, was of French extraction, daughter of a refugee from the Edict of Nantes. She is described as a woman of noble countenance and noble mind, from whom her sons inherited their best qualities. Neglected by her husband, the anxieties of her situation brought her early into ill health; but she lived to see Sydney married. Her sons early showed talents, and used to dispute with one another on subjects beyond their years, with a warmth and vehemence which delighted their mother, but which, Sydney afterwards declared,

must have made them the most intolerable and overbearing set of boys that can be imagined, till they found their level in the world. The habit of dispute did not, however, impair their affection for one another; and the elder brother Robert—Bobus, as he is called—and Sydney are examples of warm fraternal regard through life, keeping up unremitting affectionate intercourse, and dying within a fortnight of one another.

Their father judged them too nearly of an age to go to the same school. The first and third, therefore, were sent to Eton, Robert (at least) as a king's scholar, while Sydney and Courtenay went to the foundation at Winchester. The hardships, tyranny, and actual hunger Sydney endured there, no doubt influenced him through life in his not always fair or reasonable strictures on public schools, and their system of education. Both brothers, however, made rapid progress; and Sydney frequently makes ungrateful allusion to the ten thousand Latin verses he wrote at Winchester, always adding that no man in his senses would ever write another. Before becoming a fellow of New College, he spent some months in France to perfect his knowledge of French, which he always after spoke with great fluency—an accomplishment of great service to him.

Little is said of his Oxford career. He obtained his fellowship as soon as possible, and from that time his father cast him on his own resources, and never after gave him a farthing till his death. With this income of 100*l.* a-year, he not only kept out of debt, but paid 30*l.* for debts contracted at Winchester by his brother Courtenay, who dared not tell his father of his imprudence—an early union of generosity with economy, which is only characteristic of his whole course in pecuniary matters. On leaving College, it became necessary to choose a profession. His own inclination led him to the bar; but his father having incurred considerable expense in bringing up his eldest son to that profession, and in fitting out the two others for India, strongly urged his taking orders, the only alternative *he* had thought of being to send Sydney as supercargo to China. The son 'thought it his duty' to yield to his father's wishes, and became curate of the remote village of Nether-Avon on Salisbury Plain. His daughter speaks of the 'famine of the mind that came over him here,' far from books and men. His talents were, however, appreciated by his squire, Mr. Beach, who engaged him as tutor to his eldest son, with whom it was arranged that he should proceed to the University of Weimar, in Saxony. But war arose in that country, and their destination was changed to Edinburgh, where his public career began. He arrived there in 1797, and soon formed an acquaintance with the remarkable body of Scotchmen who formed

the society there, and were soon to play important parts in the world—Jeffrey, Horner, Playfair, Walter Scott, Dugald Stewart, Brougham, Allen, Brown, Murray, Leyden, Lord Webb Seymour, Lord Woodhouselee, Alison, and others. The powers of the new-comer seem to have been early appreciated by this brilliant circle, and he ever after retained a strong attachment to his Scotch friends; indeed, a fidelity to early friendship is a feature in his character. His only quarrel with Edinburgh society in after years used to be, that it wanted an infusion of fools and common persons, and was altogether too intellectual.

His sense of humour, however, seems to have been awakened by this new contact with national peculiarities; and as he was never above adopting staple allusions and points of attack as the foundations of his wit, we have many references to thistles, oatmeal, bare feet, and bad weather. It might be that, being then unknown to fame, his wit had to make its way into unprepared, unexpected ears, and, therefore, was not apprehended as readily as he ever afterwards found it to be; but it was one of his sayings, that it required a surgical operation to get a joke well into a Scotch understanding. He had already chosen his side in politics, as we gather from his being attracted to Horner by a warning against his violent opinions, though he never himself went to the lengths into which the exciting circumstances of the times led many of his party. After two years' residence in Edinburgh, he returned to England to marry Miss Pybus, a schoolfellow of his sister, to whom he had long been engaged. Her brother, one of the lords of the Admiralty and a Tory, strongly objected to the match, which, however, had her mother's full consent. She had some fortune, which he secured strictly to herself, his own worldly goods consisting, according to his own statement, of half-a-dozen attenuated silver teaspoons. He was a man, however, who had already earned a right to trust in himself; in talents able to secure a competence for his wife, and in habits of independence and self-denial to struggle through all intervening difficulties. His choice must have been a most happy one. Mrs. Smith's admiration and confidence in her husband were unbounded; and though we hear little of her in this Memoir, a gentleness and trustful easiness of temper are discernible, which must have been important elements in the happiness of the wife of a man of his restless activity, and his life of opposition to the opinions and prejudices of his own class. They returned to Edinburgh; in due course of time, a daughter, the author of this Memoir, was born, and the name Saba invented for her by her father, as he could not please himself by any to

be found in an existing nomenclature. This whim is an exception to the ordinary good sense with which he conducted his affairs; henceforward he gave Christian names to his children, and contented himself with inventing titles for his servants, his oxen, his physics, and the heroes of his political illustrations. At this time he assisted in originating the 'Edinburgh Review' in conjunction with Brougham and Jeffrey, and was appointed editor—an office which he held only for the first number, as his affairs then called him to London. For many years, however, he continued a most important and popular contributor. His own estimate of the achievement of this periodical may be learnt from the following summary:—

'To appreciate the value of the "Edinburgh Review," the state of England at the period when that journal began should be had in remembrance. The Catholics were not emancipated. The Corporation and Test Acts were unrepealed. The Game-laws were horribly oppressive; steel-traps and spring-guns were set all over the country; prisoners tried for their lives could have no counsel. Lord Eldon and the Court of Chancery pressed heavily on mankind. Libel was punished by the most cruel and vindictive imprisonments. The principles of political economy were little understood. The laws of debt and conspiracy were upon the worst footing. The enormous wickedness of the slave-trade was tolerated. A thousand evils were in existence, which the talents of good and able men have since lessened or removed; and these efforts have been not a little assisted by the honest boldness of the "Edinburgh Review."'—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp.23, 24.

His chief means of income in Edinburgh arose from his pupils, for whom he received a very large remuneration. These being educated, some change of plan was necessary, and his wife, more ambitious for him, it is said, than he was for himself, prevailed on him to choose London for his field of action. His 'profession' had found him little employment in Edinburgh, but his hopes from London must mainly depend on his success as a preacher.

His talents were various, his style good, his voice and manner effective, and in London he soon filled his chapel; and while his fame was spreading as a preacher, he was making still greater way as a converser and a wit. An acquaintance, begun some time before with Lord Holland, ripened now into friendship with him and with Lady Holland, who seems to have considered his social merits and his liberal politics as a compensation for a profession which can have possessed but little interest in her eyes. Though his own means were straitened, and he is represented as suffering some of the anxieties of poverty at this time, he gathered his friends about him at his own house; and his weekly suppers, though everything was conducted with an almost studied plainness, were long remembered for their social enjoyment.

While the Tories were in power, his chances of preferment were, of course, none at all; but the unexpected changes which in 1806 brought in the Whigs for a time, brought him a living. Whether the Hollands would have busied themselves as they did in the cause, may be considered doubtful, could they have foreseen that the condition of residence would, before long, be attached to this political reward, and that their favourite and favoured guest, who made the dinners of Holland House pass off so brilliantly, must be transported for a long term of years to the society of rustics and squires in Foston-in-the-Clay, some dozen miles from York. Such a catastrophe, however, was not contemplated at the time. It was considered a piece of unmixed prosperity. On the strength of it, he took his young family to breathe country air for the first time, to Sonning, near Reading, where he produced the celebrated 'Peter Plymley Letters,' on the subject of the Irish Roman Catholics. The effect was 'like a spark on a heap of gunpowder.' All London rang with them; editions were bought up faster than they could be printed; and though they were published anonymously, the style was too remarkable for the real author to remain a moment concealed. Mr. Perceval, Sydney Smith's main object of attack in these Letters, was unconsciously preparing his revenge, when in 1808 he introduced and passed the Residence Act. Archbishop Markham, considering that Foston had no parsonage-house, had permitted him to continue in London; but now, his only alternative was to build or resign.

'On receiving the startling summons from the Archbishop, my father went down immediately into Yorkshire, to see what his fate was to be. He found his living well deserved its name of Foston-le-Clay; consisting as it did of three hundred acres of glebe-land of the stiffest clay, in a remote village of Yorkshire, where there had not been a resident clergyman for a hundred and fifty years, owing to the wretched state of the hovel which had once been a parsonage-house. This consisted of one brick-floored kitchen, with a room above it, which was in so dangerous a condition that the farmer, who had occupied it hitherto, declined living any longer in it, and which opened on one side into a foal-yard, and on the other into the churchyard; and placed in a village where there was no society above the rank of a farmer.'—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp. 107, 108.

After various ineffectual efforts to effect an exchange, or in other ways to avert the evil, it became evident to the hapless Rector that he *must* build; and when once he saw no other course was honourably open to him, he reconciled himself with characteristic cheerfulness to his fate, and, finding the superior happiness of London life was denied him, he set about making himself happy in the country. A man of active mind, who likes looking after his own concerns, need not fear being unhappy anywhere. He threw himself with wonderful energy

into his new position. He was his own architect, his own clerk of the works, his own farmer, and within nine months of laying the first brick, inducted his family, who in the meanwhile had resided in a village near York, with hearty, noisy welcome, into the ugliest of parsonages. The scene of their arrival furnishes a fine instance of the power of mind over external circumstances, and of the good service that high animal spirits should do, not only their owner, but all who come within their influence in the flat and dispiriting occasions of life. We reckon this first evening at Foston as a greater, as well as a worthier triumph, than his cherished London ever witnessed:—

‘It was a cold, bright March day, with a biting east wind. The beds we left in the morning had to be packed up and slept on at night; wagon after wagon of furniture poured in every minute; the roads were so cut up that the carriage could not reach the door; and my mother lost her shoe in the mud, which was ankle-deep, whilst bringing her infant up to the house in her arms.

‘But oh, the shout of joy as we entered and took possession!—the first time in our lives that we had inhabited a house of our own. How we admired it, ugly as it was! With what pride my dear father welcomed us, and took us from room to room! old Molly Mills, the milk-woman, who had had charge of the house, grinning with delight in the background. We thought it a palace; yet the drawing-room had no door, the bare plaster walls ran down with wet, the windows were like ground-glass from the moisture, which had to be wiped up several times a day by the house-maid. No carpets, no chairs, nothing unpacked; rough men bringing in rougher packages at every moment. But then was the time to behold my father!—amid the confusion, he thought for everybody, cared for everybody, encouraged everybody, kept everybody in good humour. How he exerted himself! how his loud, rich voice might be heard in all directions, ordering, arranging, explaining, till the household storm gradually subsided! Each half-hour improved our condition; fires blazed in every room; at last we all sat down to our tea, spread by ourselves on a huge package before the drawing-room fire, sitting on boxes round it; and retired to sleep on our beds placed on the floor;—the happiest, merriest, and busiest family in Christendom. In a few days, under my father's active exertions, everything was arranged with tolerable comfort in the little household, and it began to assume its wonted appearance.’—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp. 162, 163.

It was no doubt a great change; but Sydney Smith had qualities of mind to fall back upon, more substantial and serviceable than wit—qualities which gave his wit its body and characteristic flavour. We cannot doubt that this transportation was both for his happiness and dignity. He must now take a standing of his own, not only in opinions, but in action. He was thrown upon himself, and powers were developed, for which his previous life had offered no field. His letters at the time show a manly spirit and a practical philosophy, in both realizing his position, and making the best of it. ‘I feel sometimes melancholy,’ he says to Lady Holland, ‘at the idea of quitting London—the warm precincts of the cheerful day; but it is the

'will of God, and I am sure I shall gain by it wealth, knowledge, and happiness.' And again to the same:—

'My dear Lady Holland,—I hear you laugh at me for being happy in the country, and upon this I have a few words to say. In the first place, whether one lives or dies, I hold and have always held to be of infinitely less moment than is generally supposed; but if life is to be, then it is common sense to amuse yourself with the best you can find where you happen to be placed. I am not leading precisely the life I should choose, but that which (all things considered, as well as I could consider them) appeared to me to be the most eligible. I am resolved, therefore, to like it, and to reconcile myself to it; which is more manly than to feign myself above it, and to send up complaints by the post, of being thrown away, and being desolate, and such like trash. I am prepared, therefore, either way. If the chances of life ever enable me to emerge, I will show you that I have not been wholly occupied by small and sordid pursuits. If (as the greater probability is) I am come to the end of my career, I give myself quietly up to horticulture, &c. In short, if it be my lot to crawl, I will crawl contentedly; if to fly, I will fly with alacrity; but, as long as I can possibly avoid it, I will never be unhappy. If, with a pleasant wife, three children, a good house and farm, many books, and many friends, who wish me well, I cannot be happy, I am a very silly, foolish fellow, and what becomes of me is of very little consequence.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. pp. 56, 57.

In the country his position was more independent. Instead of being an appendage of Holland House, always to be relied on, great people must find their way to him. Coaches-and-four with outriders had soon to be extricated out of the clay fields of Foston, in their first voyages of discovery; and those who came once put up with some inconveniences to be so entertained again. There his bodily activity found full play. He undertook all sorts of occupations—was tutor to his son, doctor to the whole parish, farmer of his glebe, and purveyor to the domestic wants of his family, and everything he did was well done, and in a fashion entirely his own. Absolutely free from affectation, he could yet do nothing in a common-place manner; and this infusion of himself into all he did seems to have had a wonderful power of fascination on all who came near him. Children were always attracted to him; a confidence which his tender, patient sympathy with all their thoughts and wishes, and the trouble he gave himself for them, well deserved. His labourers would work night and day for him; his servants, whom he trained after his own peculiar fashion, delighted in waiting upon him. If he went shopping, an occupation he seems to have affected, the whole business of the shop was suspended, that customers and shopmen alike might listen to what Sydney Smith was saying. He was the oracle of his family, the source of all their interests, occupations, and amusements. His guests kept note of their visits to his parsonage as one of the bright spots in their lives. No hearers were too homely or too familiar for his jokes, which

were always forthcoming, and needed no stimulus of excitement; while there is no point on which his daughter is more jealous than that he should be supposed a mere joker. She assures us, and brings forward many testimonies in support of her opinion, that his serious hours were more delightful than his jesting ones, and that his wit never seemed more brilliant than when placed in sudden contrast with his thoughtful moods—moods which, no doubt, were promoted by the comparative quiet of his parsonage; for we find him at once moralizing and philosophising in set terms, when he finds it necessary to adapt himself to the new order of things.

In 1828, when he had held Foston twenty-two years, Lord Lyndhurst, out of private friendship, and to the natural surprise of his party, gave him a canonry of Bristol, which entitled him to the living of Combe Florey, in Somersetshire—a most acceptable exchange from Foston, both for its fine situation and as bringing an increase of means. Sydney Smith was no admirer of poverty, and ‘could safely say,’ in reviewing his life, ‘that he had been happier every guinea he had gained.’ In 1831 Lord Grey appointed him to a prebendal stall at St. Paul’s, in exchange for that of Bristol—a piece of preferment which exactly suited all his tastes, and which he enjoyed for fourteen years. For the last years of his life he was a rich man, as he came in for more than 30,000*l.* at his brother Courtenay’s death—the brother who, in his youth, he had rescued from family disgrace by the cost of 30*l.* Sydney Smith left two daughters and a tribe of grandchildren, in whom he took great delight. His promising son Douglas had died at Foston at the age of twenty-four, to his father’s great grief.

His career may, on the whole, be called a consistent one. It is true, that his whole course of life and action struck religious people as inconsistent with his sacred calling. They could not reconcile his assumption of it either with the acknowledged principles of many of his chosen friends and most intimate associates, or with the careless jollity of his own habits. They could not understand a clergyman’s virulent attacks on every form of religious profession which aimed at a higher, stricter life than the life of the world, whether seen in the efforts of our missionaries, the development of the evangelical party, the first stirring of the High Church movement, the revivals of the Dissenters, or the asceticism of Rome—all indiscriminately ridiculed and set down as enthusiasm, fanaticism, Methodism, ‘Puseyism,’ and madness: his absolutely careless toleration of every form of religious difference or error—his intolerance of all religion, zealously at work, putting itself forward, interfering with society, and seeking to rouse men to a sense of

its claims upon them. Nevertheless, his own line was clear throughout. His mind was political. He regarded religion mainly as a political engine.

Let us, in passing, illustrate our position by quoting a passage or two from his remarkable article in the 'Edinburgh,' against all attempts to convert the natives of India. We call it remarkable, not only as proceeding from a minister of the Gospel, but as having been inserted by a leading review. It was tolerated, we presume, because the attack seemed to be directed against the Baptist Mission, whose agents indulged largely in a sectarian and unctuous phraseology sufficiently open to ridicule. But the attack is really against all attempts at converting our fellow-subjects in India. Public opinion, we may hope, has made some strides in the last fifty years, for no periodical calling itself Christian could insert such an article now. It is justice to say, that in the beginning an admission is made of the general Christian duty of disseminating our religion amongst the Pagan nations, even going so far as to say, 'We believe that we are 'in possession of a revealed religion; that the possession of that 'religion can alone confer immortality, and best confer happiness.' But a conviction so candidly stated is not allowed to affect our practice, if our national prosperity is to be ever so slightly threatened by it. He charged the Government with being indifferent to this risk.

'It is in vain to say, that these attempts to diffuse Christianity do not originate from the Government in India. The omnipotence of government in the East is well known to the natives. If government does not prohibit, it tolerates; if it tolerates the conversion of the natives, the suspicion may be easily formed that it encourages that conversion. If the Brahmins do not believe this themselves, they may easily persuade the common people that such is the fact; nor are there wanting, besides the activity of these new missionaries, many other circumstances to corroborate such a rumour. Under the auspices of the College at Fort William, the Scriptures are in a course of translation into the languages of almost the whole continent of Oriental India, and we perceive that in aid of this object the Bible Society has voted a very magnificent subscription. The three principal chaplains of our Indian settlement are (as might be expected) of principles exactly corresponding with the enthusiasm of their employers at home, and their zeal upon the subject of religion has shone and burnt with the most exemplary fury.'—*Works*, vol. i. p. 160.

Again,—

'Methodism at home is no unprofitable game to play. In the East, it will soon be the infallible road to promotion. This is the great evil. If the management was in the hands of men who were as discreet and wise in their devotion as they are in matters of temporal welfare, the desire of putting an end to missions might be premature and indecorous. But the misfortune is, the men who wield the instrument ought not, in common sense and propriety, to be trusted with it for a single moment. . . .

'Again, we repeat, that upon such subjects the best and ablest men, if once tinged by fanaticism, are not to be trusted for a single moment.'—*Works*, vol. i. p. 162.

We believe that such strange perversities as these arise from a certain habitual inability (however caused) to realize distant eternal things. We find him, for instance, using the word *immortal*, and then immediately flying against it. But the *present* had a wonderful grasp on his mind. It was his maxim of happiness to take *short* views, which may be right as against anticipating earthly misfortune; but he carried it to a monstrous extreme, and evidently sets time against eternity, as in the following passage:—

'The duty of conversion is less plain and less imperious, when conversion exposes the convert to great present misery. An African or an Otaheite proselyte might not perhaps be less honoured by his countrymen if he became a Christian; an Hindoo is instantly subjected to the most perfect degradation. A change of faith might increase the immediate happiness of any other individual; it annihilates for ever all the *human* comforts which an Hindoo enjoys; the eternal happiness which you proffer him is therefore less attractive to him than to any other heathen, from the life of misery by which he purchases it. Nothing is more precarious than our empire in India. Suppose we were to be driven out of it to-morrow, and to leave behind us 20,000 converted Hindoos, it is most probable they would relapse into heathenism; but their original station in society could not be regained. The duty of making converts, therefore, among such people, as it arises from the general duty of benevolence, is less strong than it would be in many other cases, because, situated as we are, it is quite certain we shall expose them to a great deal of misery, and not quite certain we shall do them any future good.'—*Works*, vol. i. p. 168.

Again,—

'If it is a duty of general benevolence to convert the heathen, it is less duty to convert the Hindoos than any other people, because they are already highly civilized, and because you must infallibly subject them to infamy and present degradation.'—*Works*, vol. i. p. 173.

We see, from passages like this, a mind entirely warped by worldly considerations, and blind to the supreme importance of eternal things. Yet in his own heart he revered religion. His friends describe his character as truly humble, a humility not of nature only, but the result of Christian principle; so that whenever he gave way to hastiness, a natural infirmity, he could find no rest till he had humbled himself to the aggrieved party: 'it mattered not whom, groom or child.' He had no sympathies with or tendencies towards scepticism; he told his children he would rather see them in their graves than unbelievers. We are even now and then gratified by indications of genuine seriousness, of his mind recurring to sacred things with awe and pleasure, and there is incidental mention of family prayer and of pastoral visits—of one paid, lantern in hand, on a winter's night to a sick parishioner—as showing that he did not

confine his professional labours to the Church's public services. Again, he threw his mind into his sermons. There are many fine, earnest passages in them; and his mode of conducting the services was so impressive, that one of his lady admirers compliments his manner as resembling 'the proud dignity of a High Churchman.' Moreover, he was conscientious, and preached as energetic sermons, and showed as much stately dignity to the rustics, at Foston, as in York Minster or S. Paul's. He sincerely preferred the Church to Dissent, which he viewed always as something narrow-minded and fanatical. He thought a wealthy establishment, diffusing over the country its staff of respectable, well-educated men, preaching 'rational piety,' an incalculable gain. So long as the Clergy confined themselves to their round of duties, alternated with social pleasure, let Dissenters and Romanists alone, and neither talked nor thought too much about doctrine, he could think of them with complacency, contenting himself only with an occasional bit at their dulness and the inevitable rustiness of their understandings. And also he fought their battles, and raised himself into a champion of their independence and temporal interests. All these things considered, Sydney Smith thought himself a credit to his profession. He esteemed himself ill used that his Whig friends did not make him a bishop, and was satisfied that he could have fulfilled the duties of that office extremely well.

Perhaps he considered this elevation was only his due for having, as he would consider, sacrificed his great talents to a profession that could neither give him pecuniary reward nor distinction amongst his chosen friends. It is certain that he felt his profession a dead weight. 'The law,' he said, 'is decidedly the best profession for a young man, if he has anything in him. In the Church a man is thrown into life with his hands tied, and bid to swim; he does well if he keeps his head above water.' He never forgot that he was a parson, nor how discordant and uncongenial this must be with the feelings and associations of the society he most cared for. His letters are full of apologetic allusions to his calling, amusing of course, but not the less proceeding from an awkward sense of its being looked down upon in the busy, fashionable, political circles which were his world. To one lady he writes: 'You live in the midst of political economists; pray tell me what they say about him (Jones). It must not be forgotten that he is a parson; but as you overlook it in me, forgive it in him. I would not have mentioned this, but I am sure you would have heard it from his enemies.' Supposing that others always kept it in their minds that he was a clergyman, and not quite their ideal of one, he anticipates the jest. To Lady Ashburton: 'What is real piety?

'what is true attachment to the Church? how are these fine feelings best evinced? The answer is plain, by sending strawberries to a clergyman.' To the same lady with a print: 'Miss Mildman told me yesterday, that you had been looking about for a print of the Rev. Sydney Smith. Here he is; pray accept him. I said to the artist, whatever you do, preserve the orthodox look.' To another: 'Will you come to a philosophical breakfast on Saturday,—ten o'clock precisely? Nothing taken for granted. Everything (except the Thirty-nine Articles) called in question—real philosophers.' Mrs. Marcet complained she could not sleep. 'I can furnish you,' he said, 'with a perfect soporific. I have published two volumes of sermons; take them to bed with you. I recommended them once to Blanco White, and, before the third page, he was fast,' &c. &c. In connexion with the same feeling are his allusions to Dissenters, with whom he thinks it in keeping to assume a constant antagonism and lofty contempt. 'Fine weather,' he writes, one summer, 'or, to speak more truly, dreadful heat. I have suffered no damage in corn nor hay; while many Dissenters in the neighbourhood have lost their crops.' His relaxation in illness is reading 'The Dissenter tripped up.' He boasts of having brought his servant to the same mind. 'You would not believe it, to look at him now, but D. is a reformed Quaker. Yes, he quaked, or did quake; his brother quakes still. But D. is now thoroughly orthodox. I should not like to be a Dissenter in his way.' And one of his latest recorded jokes upon his own bodily weakness was, 'I verily believe that if the knife was put into my hand, I should not have strength or energy enough to stick it into a Dissenter.'

There was no order in the Church that did not incur contumely, at one time or another, from the workings of this spirit. Curates, unless they were in a transition state, expecting livings, and in circumstances to be indifferent to their small stipends, were a miserable class. He assumed most of them to belong to a very humble rank in society, and their privations such as they were born to. Of the country clergy he writes: 'If there is a helpless, friendless, wretched being in the community, it is a poor clergyman with a large family.' And against the Bishops he is at constant war for some cause or another. He confesses to this himself, and in a higher state of existence foresees that 'he shall be more respectful to the upper clergy.' He considered them oppressors of the lower clergy, and quarrels with their ungraciousness of manner. He wrote an article against the Bishop of Peterborough's eighty-seven questions, in which he has certainly the right on his side; for, as he justly asks a lady correspondent, 'What right has any

man to ask another eighty-seven questions?' He attacks the Bishop of Lincoln (Prettyman), in another, in unmeasured terms, for his Charge against Roman Catholic Emancipation; and the bitterest words that ever fell from him were addressed to Monk, Bishop of Gloucester, who had replied to his arguments against the Commission on Deans and Chapters, by asserting that he had been appointed to the canonry of S. Paul's because he was a scoffer and a jester. Indeed, before this happy event, he was apt to regard the whole class simply as withholders of preferment out of the hands of their betters. 'I think Lord Grey will give me some preferment if he stays in long enough; but the upper parsons live vindictively, and evince their aversion to a Whig ministry by an improved health. The Bishop of —— has the rancour to recover after three paralytic strokes, and the Dean of —— to be vigorous at eighty-two. And yet these men call themselves Christians!'

It is only justice, after these strictures, to present his principles in another aspect, and to show the reverse, if there be one. Some of his sermons are given in his works. He liked preaching, and threw his heart into it. His manner was emphatic, because he felt the difficulty of securing attention. 'Even the cry of a child,' he wrote, 'the fall of a book, the most trifling occurrence, is sufficient to dissipate religious thought, and to introduce a more willing train of ideas; a sparrow fluttering about a church, is an antagonist which the most profound theologian in Europe is unable to overcome.' He argued, therefore, for energy of manner, and warns a lady who wishes to hear him preach, not to flatter herself with the delusive hope of slumber. 'I preach violently, and there is a strong smell of sulphur in my sermons.' And again, 'When I began to thump the cushion of my pulpit, on first coming to Foston, as is my wont when I preach, the accumulated dust of a hundred and fifty years made such a cloud that for some minutes I lost sight of my congregation.' Very late in life, he thinks he could write a good sermon on war, but dreads the fatigue. 'It makes me ill, I get violently excited, and tire myself to death.' Mrs. Austen describes his manner and appearance in preaching as impressive and raising deep attention. She had feared the effect that a face and voice always associated with wit and mirth might have upon her; 'but the moment he appeared in the pulpit, all the weight of his duty, all the authority of his office, were written on his countenance, and, without a particle of affectation, his whole demeanour bespoke the gravity of his purpose.' From all accounts, he must indeed have erred on the side of solemnity. From many striking passages bearing tokens of individual

thought and principle, we take the following, from an assize sermon preached at York, entitled 'The Lawyer that tempted Christ:—

'It falls to the lot of those who are engaged in the active and arduous profession of the law to pass their time in great cities, amidst severe and incessant occupation, requiring all the faculties, and calling forth from time to time many of the strongest passions of our nature. In the midst of all this, rivals are to be watched, superiors are to be cultivated, connexions cherished; some portion of life must be given to society, and some little relaxation and amusement. When, then, is the question to be asked, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" what leisure for the altar, what time for God? I appeal to the experience of men engaged in this profession, whether religious feelings, religious practices, are not, without any speculative unbelief, perpetually sacrificed to the business of the world. Are not the habits of devotion gradually displaced by other habits of solicitude, hurry, and care, totally incompatible with habits of devotion? Is not the taste for devotion lessened? Is not the time for devotion abridged? Are you not more and more conquered, against your warnings, against your will—not, perhaps, without pain and compunction—by the Mammon of life? And what is the cure for this great evil to which your profession exposes you? The cure is, to keep a sacred place in your heart where Almighty God is enshrined, and where nothing human can enter; to say to the world, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further;" to remember you are a lawyer, without forgetting you are a Christian; to wish for no more wealth than ought to be possessed by an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven; to covet no more, however, than is suitable to a child of God; boldly and bravely to set yourself limits, and to show to others you have limits, and that no professional eagerness, and no professional activity, shall ever induce you to infringe upon the rules and practices of religion. Remember the text; put the great question really, which the tempter of Christ only pretended to put. In the midst of your highest success, or the most perfect gratification of your vanity, in the most ample increase of your wealth, fall down at the feet of Jesus, and say, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 185.

We have before us a little volume of six sermons, preached in Edinburgh, and published in 1800, of which his daughter makes no mention in her Memoir. Being composed before the commencement of the 'Edinburgh Review,' they are, no doubt, his first work, and are characteristic of their author, as is also his autograph in the title-page, where he wrote, in a neat, clear, eighteenth century hand, 'A little present to Miss —, from the Author, to induce her to go to church, and to behave pretty there.' The subjects of two are political, and show a moderation and commendable love of what is established, which prove him wiser than his friends at that period of democratic excitement. Two others are entitled 'Scepticism,' and 'The Conversion of S. Paul,' and are both addressed against infidelity, in a tone which can be easily imagined; for doctrine, as such, never finds a place in his writings; but they are energetic and sincere. And two are on our duties to the poor and unfortunate. Of these, the most striking is one preached for the

Magdalene Society, which contains passages of deep feeling, showing that 'human heart' which imparted such genial warmth to all he said and wrote. One incident we must quote, for its pathos:—

'The great attention which has always been paid to reconcile reclaimed children to their parents, is a very pleasing feature in the conduct of this charity. The protection and countenance of the parent gives stability to the new virtue of the child, and the renewal of this endearing relation is strictly congenial to our most lively feelings.

'A young female was received some time since into the Society, who, in consequence of the infamous character she had incurred, had been wholly abandoned by her poor but respectable parents, for above four years. You all know the extreme care with which the poor people attend to the religious and moral education of their children in this part of the world; and will, I am sure, in the goodness of your hearts, anticipate the feelings of two poor villagers as they speculated on the future prospects of their late beloved inmate, their fears for her safety, their humble ambition, their hope that they had not in vain suffered want for her improvement, their ardent prayers to Almighty God for their child. Not to dwell upon intermediate scenes, by the interference of the Society the father agreed to receive his daughter, and they were brought together. The appearance of each before they met was wonderfully impressive. In the child there were marks of the deepest contrition and humility; a sense of joy at the idea of seeing her father, mingled with a perturbation which bordered on delirious wildness. In the poor man there was an honest shame at the disgrace which his daughter had incurred, not wholly devoid of anger; but it was easy to see how much his compassion ruled over every other feeling of his mind. Such was the interesting appearance of these poor people before they met; but when they saw each other, there was no shame, there was no dread, there was no anger, there was no contrition; but there were tears, and cries, and loud sobbings, and convulsive embraces, and the father wept over his daughter and loved her; and they that saw this bear witness how blessed a thing it is to snatch a human soul from perdition, and to show the paths of God to poor sinners, and to shower down the glories of virtue and religion on the last and lowest of mankind.'—*Six Sermons preached in Charlotte Street, Edinburgh*, p. 92.

Sydney Smith's style is so much part of himself, so pervades all he says, as well as what he wrote, that it can hardly be discussed by itself. Yet it is as individual and remarkable as any style that ever was written; an instrument that perfectly served him, and enabled him always to produce the effect he aimed at. He had no thoughts which he found it difficult to express, or which were above expression; he always made people understand what he meant, and that in the briefest, most original, attractive method. But for the fundamental deficiency we have noted—akin to, though not the same as, want of imagination—he might have made a poet. His gift of expression, his happy art of illustration, his faculty of bringing every subject he touched on home to men's business and bosoms, are all powers essential to the poet. It is the difference of object alone that draws the broad line of distinction. The poet's aim is to lift

his hearers' minds above and beyond their common mood, *up to* his subject. With Sydney Smith, whatever his theme, he brings it down to the ordinary level of his reader. By the use of the homeliest imagery, and by appeals to men's most familiar interests, he subjects it to the decision of every-day impressions, and plain, unassisted common-sense. Whatever his subject, be it the wrongs of the Irish Roman Catholics, the rights of the English Church, the exposure of social abuses and injustice, political reform, or religious enthusiasm, as a writer, as a speaker, as a preacher, he never for a moment seeks to lift his hearer into unfamiliar, elevated trains of thought. He addresses every man as a being endowed with a keen and lively appreciation of this world's good things, and an equally strong objection to pain and discomfort; and, working upon these universal instincts, he appeals to their feelings of justice, their common-sense, and their good-nature. In other hands, such a line of argument would hardly fail to degenerate into vulgarity; but from this our author is saved by his genial play of wit. We receive it all as a satire on poor human nature; and while we own to the charge, and feel the force of the appeal to our lower nature, our intellect is charmed by the felicity of his illustrations, the strange affinities he finds in seeming opposites, his sudden and unexpected turns of attack, and the brightness and affluence of his humour. Let us take a few examples of his style of argument, from the *Plymley Letters*. The question of Roman Catholic emancipation had hitherto been argued as a theological one. This was a light in which he could not view it; his coldness in all matters of speculative doctrine assisting him here to approach the subject on its legitimate grounds. He at once removes the subject into another court, just allays his Protestant reader's fears by a few pithy expressions of contempt at the most unpopular Romish practices, but in the main makes light of religious differences altogether—throws them in the back-ground, and appeals to his common fairness towards fellow-subjects, who in all civil and social matters, in those concerns in which they act with him, think and feel with himself.

'I have often thought, if the *wisdom of our ancestors* had excluded all persons with red hair from the House of Commons, of the throes and convulsions it would occasion to restore them to their natural rights. What mobs and riots would it produce! To what infinite abuse and obloquy would the capillary patriot be exposed; what wormwood would distil from Mr. Perceval—what froth would drop from Mr. Canning—how (I will not say *my*, but *our* Lord Hawkesbury, for he belongs to us all)—how our Lord Hawkesbury would work away about the hair of King William and Lord Somers, and the authors of the great and glorious Revolution—how Lord Eldon would appeal to the Deity and his own virtues, and to the hair of his children. Some would say that red-haired men were superstitious; some would prove they were Atheists; they would be petitioned against as the friends of

slavery, and the advocates for revolt; in short, such a corrupter of the heart and understanding is the spirit of persecution, that these unfortunate people (conspired against by their fellow-subjects of every complexion), if they did not emigrate to countries where hair of another colour was persecuted, would be driven to the falsehood of perukes, or the hypocrisy of the Tricorian fluid.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 328.

He was apprehensive of invasion, and of the discontents of the Roman Catholics being turned by Bonaparte to his own account.

'What is it the Catholics ask of you? Do not exclude us from the honours and emoluments of the state, because we worship God in one way, and you worship Him in another,—in a period of the deepest peace, and the fattest prosperity, this would be a fair request: it should be granted, if Lord Hawkesbury had reached Paris, if Mr. Canning's interpreter had threatened the senate in an opening speech, or Mr. Perceval explained to them the improvements he meant to introduce into the Catholic religion; but to deny the Irish this justice now, in the present state of Europe, and in the summer months, just as the season for destroying kingdoms is coming on, is (beloved Abraham), whatever you may think of it, little short of positive insanity.

'Here is a frigate attacked by a corsair of immense strength and size, rigging cut, masts in danger of coming by the board, four foot water in the hold, men dropping off very fast; in this dreadful situation, how do you think the captain acts (whose name shall be Perceval)? He calls all hands upon deck; talks to them of king, country, glory, sweethearts, gin, French prison, wooden shoes, Old England, and hearts of oak: they give three cheers, rush to their guns, and, after a tremendous conflict, succeed in beating off the enemy. Not a syllable of all this; this is not the manner in which the honourable commander goes to work: the first thing he does is to secure twenty or thirty of his prime sailors who happen to be Catholics, to clap them in irons, and set over them a guard of as many Protestants; having taken this admirable method of defending himself against his infidel opponents, he goes upon deck, reminds the sailors, in a very bitter harangue, that they are of different religions; exhorts the episcopal gunner not to trust to the Presbyterian quarter-master; issues positive orders that the Catholics should be fired at upon the first appearance of discontent; rushes through blood and brains, examining his men in the Catechism and Thirty-nine Articles, and positively forbids every one to sponge or ram who has not taken the Sacrament according to the Church of England. Was it right to take out a captain made of excellent British stuff, and to put in such a man as this? Is he not more like a parson, or a talking lawyer, than a thorough-bred seaman? And built as she is of heart of oak, and admirably manned, is it possible with such a captain to save this ship from going to the bottom?'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 301.

He pities the Irish Roman Catholics for their compulsory honesty.

'The grand juries in Ireland are the great scene of jobbing. They have a power of making a county rate to a considerable extent for roads, bridges, and other objects of general accommodation. "You suffer the road to be brought through my park, and I will have the bridge constructed in a situation where it will make a beautiful object to your house. You do my job, and I will do yours." These are the sweet and interesting subjects which occasionally occupy Milesian gentlemen while they are attendant upon this grand inquest of justice. But there is a religion, it seems, even in jobs; and it will be highly gratifying to Mr. Perceval to learn that no man in

Ireland who believes in seven sacraments can carry a public road, or bridge, one yard out of the direction most beneficial to the public, and that nobody can cheat that public who does not expound the Scriptures in the purest and most orthodox manner. This will give pleasure to Mr. Perceval: but, from his unfairness upon these topics, I appeal to the justice and the proper feelings of Mr. Huskisson. I ask him if the human mind can experience a more dreadful sensation than to see its own jobs refused, and the jobs of another religion perpetually succeeding? I ask him his opinion of a jobless faith, of a creed which dooms a man through life to a lean and plunderless integrity. He knows that human nature cannot and will not bear it; and if he were to paint a political Tartarus, it would be an endless series of snug expectations and cruel disappointments. These are a few of many dreadful inconveniences which the Catholics of all ranks suffer from the laws by which they are at present oppressed. Besides, look at human nature:—what is the history of all professions? Joel is to be brought up to the bar: has Mrs. Plymley the slightest doubt of his being chancellor? Do not his two shrivelled aunts live in the certainty of seeing him in that situation, and of cutting out with their own hands his equity habiliments? And I could name a certain minister of the Gospel who does not, in the bottom of his heart, much differ from these opinions. Do you think that the fathers and mothers of the holy Catholic Church are not as absurd as Protestant papas and mammas? The probability I admit to be, in each particular case, that the sweet little blockhead will in fact never get a brief;—but I will venture to say, there is not a parent from the Giant's Causeway to Bantry Bay who does not conceive that his child is the unfortunate victim of the exclusion, and that nothing short of positive law could prevent his own dear pre-eminent Paddy from rising to the highest honours of the state.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 360.

He illustrates the effect of penal laws on the popular mind:—

'The effects of penal laws, in matters of religion, are never confined to those limits in which the legislature intended they should be placed: it is not only that I am excluded from certain offices and dignities because I am a Catholic, but the exclusion carries with it a certain stigma, which degrades me in the eyes of the monopolising sect, and the very name of my religion becomes odious. These effects are so very striking in England, that I solemnly believe blue and red baboons to be more popular here than Catholics and Presbyterians; they are more understood, and there is a greater disposition to do something for them. When a country squire hears of an ape, his first feeling is to give it nuts and apples; when he hears of a Dissenter, his immediate impulse is to commit it to the county jail, to shave its head, to alter its customary food, and to have it privately whipped.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 324.

He pours on his antagonist a torrent of eloquence and ridicule:—

'I cannot describe the horror and disgust which I felt at hearing Mr. Perceval call upon the then ministry for measures of vigour in Ireland. If I lived at Hampstead upon stewed meats and claret; if I walked to church every Sunday before eleven young gentlemen of my own begetting, with their faces washed, and their hair pleasingly combed; if the Almighty had blessed me with every earthly comfort,—how awfully would I pause before I sent forth the flame and the sword over the cabins of the poor, brave, generous, open-hearted peasants of Ireland! How easy it is to shed human blood—how much in all ages have wounds and shrieks and tears been the cheap and vulgar resources of the rulers of mankind—how difficult and how noble it is to govern in kindness, and to found an empire upon the ever-

lasting basis of justice and affection! But what do men call vigour? To let loose hussars and to bring up artillery, to govern with lighted matches, and to cut, and push, and prime—I call this, not vigour, but the *sloth of cruelty and ignorance*. The vigour I love, consists in finding out wherein subjects are aggrieved, in relieving them, in studying the temper and genius of a people, in consulting their prejudices, in selecting proper persons to lead and manage them, in the laborious, watchful, and difficult task of increasing public happiness by allaying each particular discontent. In this way Hoche pacified La Vendée—and in this way only will Ireland ever be subdued. But this, in the eyes of Mr. Perceval, is imbecility and meanness: houses are not broke open—women are not insulted—the people seem all to be happy; they are not rode over by horses, and cut by whips. Do you call this vigour?—Is this government?—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 369.

And, again, summing up the Tory administration:—

‘If we conciliate Ireland, we can do nothing amiss; if we do not, we can do nothing well. If Ireland was friendly, we might equally set at defiance the talents of Bonaparte and the blunders of his rival, Mr. Canning; we could then support the ruinous and silly bustle of our useless expeditions, and the almost incredible ignorance of our commercial orders in council. Let the present administration give up but this one point, and there is nothing which I would not consent to grant them. Mr. Perceval shall have full liberty to insult the tomb of Mr. Fox, and to torment every eminent Dissenter in Great Britain; Lord Camden shall have large boxes of plums; Mr. Rose receive permission to prefix to his name the appellative of virtuous; and to the Viscount Castlereagh a round sum of ready money shall be well and truly paid into his hand. Lastly, what remains to Mr. George Canning, but that he ride up and down Pall Mall gloriously upon a white horse, and that they cry out before him, Thus shall it be done to the statesman who hath written “The Needy Knife-grinder,” and the German play?—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 349.

To this mention of Lord Castlereagh, his candour subsequently led him to append in a note these words: ‘This is a very unjust imputation on Lord Castlereagh.’

The contempt with which he regarded the possibility of any general return to Rome is put in language highly characteristic of his own mind, and curious on other accounts to us who have watched the progress of events in the last twenty or thirty years:—

‘As for the enormous wax candles, and superstitious mummeries, and painted jackets of the Catholic priests, I fear them not. Tell me that the world will return again under the influence of small-pox; that Lord Castlereagh will hereafter oppose the power of the Court; that Lord Howick and Mr. Grattan will do each of them a mean and dishonourable action; that anybody who has heard Lord Redesdale speak once will knowingly and willingly hear him again; that Lord Eldon has assented to the fact of two and two making four, without shedding tears or expressing the smallest doubt or scruple; tell me any other thing absurd or incredible, but for the love of common sense let me hear no more of the danger to be apprehended from the general diffusion of Popery. It is too absurd to be reasoned upon; every man feels it is nonsense when he hears it stated, and so does every man while he is stating it.’—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 327.

The following, from an article on the same subject, is an example of his appeal to men's lower interests, and his disbelief in classes of men being moved by any other consideration. Such searching investigations of motives may not be without their use :—

'What is the real reason why a good honest Tory, living at ease on his possessions, is an enemy to Catholic emancipation. He admits the Catholic of his own rank to be a gentleman, and not a bad subject, and about theological disputes an excellent Tory never troubles his head. Of what importance is it to him whether an Irish Catholic or an Irish Protestant is a judge in the King's Bench at Dublin? None; *but I am afraid of the Church of Ireland*, says our alarmist. Why do you care so much for the Church of Ireland, a country you never live in?—Answer—*I do not care so much for the Church of Ireland if I was sure the Church of England would not be destroyed.* And is it for the Church of England alone that you fear?—Answer—*Not quite to that; but I am afraid we should all be lost, that everything would be overturned, and that I should lose my rank and my estate.* Here, then, we say, is a long series of dangers which (if there were any chance of their ever taking place) would require half a century for their development; and the danger of losing Ireland by insurrection and invasion, which may happen any six months, is utterly overlooked and forgotten. And if a foreign influence should ever be fairly established in Ireland, how many hours would the Irish Church, how many months would the English Church, live after such an event? How much is any English title worth after such an event—any English family—any English estate? We are astonished that the brains of rich Englishmen do not fall down into their bellies in talking of the Catholic question—that they do not reason through the cardia and the pylorus, that all the organs of digestion do not become intellectual. The descendants of the proudest noblemen in England may become beggars in a foreign land from this disgraceful nonsense of the Catholic question, fit only for the ancient females of a market-town.'—*Edinburgh Review*, Sydney Smith's Works, vol. ii. p. 390.

And as he had no faith in bodies of men acting on principle, and in fact wins his own influence by witty appeals to their most sordid interests, so for his own true principles he professed himself and pleaded for others no higher motives. All his wit, all his humour, rests on the exclusion of lofty and chivalrous motives: in the opposition of what he believes to be man's real actuating motives, with attendant grotesquely-familiar details, to those lofty views and romantic circumstances which prescription assigns to great questions and events. Compare, for instance, his idea of an invasion with the supposed one described by Sir Walter Scott in the 'Antiquary,' which puts every reader on his mettle. In exchange for the universal impulse of disinterested patriotism—which stirs us there,—all private interests lost in the one great public one,—we have a very natural and ludicrous picture of a panic, and the probable circumstances of devastation and individual loss, likely to scare a rude peasantry: 'old wheat and beans blazing for twenty miles round; cart-mares shot; sows of Lord Somerville's breed

'running wild about the country, &c. &c.; the rustics herding 'behind hedge-rows, plate-racks, hen-coops,' and so on. He had a sincere, conscientious horror of war: it might have been strengthened by the war of his time being opposed by his party, but it was a genuine sentiment in him; he realized its evils, and the wreck it made of human happiness. But his appeal is always to men's ease and pockets, not to their principles. It was a saying of his to his children, of which he made good practical use, 'Nothing is so expensive as glory.' In writing on America, and the danger of its being inflamed by this spirit, he assumes that our great European struggle was entered upon in no higher motive, and thus warns the Americans by our example:—

'We can inform Jonathan what are the inevitable consequences of being too fond of glory: TAXES upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot—taxes upon everything which is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, or taste; taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion; taxes on everything on earth, and the waters under the earth; on everything that comes from abroad, or is grown at home; taxes on the raw material; taxes on every fresh value that is added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite, and the drug that restores him to health—on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal—on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice—on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribands of the bride; at bed or board, couchant or levant, we must pay. The schoolboy whips his taxed top; the beardless youth manages his taxed horse, with a taxed bridle, on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid 7 per cent., into a spoon that has paid 15 per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz bed, which has paid 22 per cent., and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a licence of a hundred pounds for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then immediately taxed from 2 to 10 per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel; his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble; and he is then gathered to his fathers to be taxed no more.'—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 13.

This was written in 1820, during Tory ascendancy. A few years after, the Whigs, in their sympathy with liberal disturbances throughout Europe, assumed a warlike tone, on which Sydney Smith thus expresses himself to Lady Grey:—

'I cannot help saying a word about war. For God's sake do not drag me into another war! I am worn down, and worn out, with crusading and defending Europe, and protecting mankind; I *must* think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards—I am sorry for the Greeks—I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Bagdad is oppressed—I do not like the present state of the Delta—Tibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid the consequence will be, that we shall cut each

other's throats. No war, dear Lady Grey!—no eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic! I beseech you, secure Lord Grey's sword and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armour. If there is another war, life will not be worth having. I will go to war with the King of Denmark if he is impertinent to you, or does any injury to Howick; but for no other cause.

"May the vengeance of Heaven" overtake all the Legitimates of Verona! but, in the present state of rent and taxes, they must be *left* to the vengeance of Heaven. I allow fighting in such a cause to be a luxury; but the business of a prudent, sensible man, is to guard against luxury."—*Works*, vol. ii. pp. 235, 236.

His wit was of the pleasantest as well as of the most genuine kind. His gift of finding affinities in things apparently opposite, in bringing together and harmonising the most contrary ideas, was extraordinary; the strangeness as well as aptness of his similitudes, the rapidity of his changes, the readiness of his rejoinders, his felicity of expression, are all perfect in their way. With all there is a constant geniality and good humour, which keep our liking on a par with our amusement and admiration. The 'Letters,' though in a less finished style than his *Works*, contain abundant indications of what his conversation must have been; and though no record of good things can convey an adequate idea of humour, which must in every case depend so much on manner, the impression left on the reader at the end of the two volumes is, that he was certainly one of the greatest wits of our time. We are struck with his freshness. We see the justice of the compliment, that 'his wit had always the dew on it.' It was ever flowing; he had no need to be sparing or to keep it for state occasions. It amused himself as well as his hearers. It was never the result of labour, and needed no preparation. It was not too choice or elaborate, but disdained not to divert itself with the same subjects for mirth that have amused all ages. Like Falstaff's, it partook of the large, open, jovial character of his figure and temperament. Had he been a small man, his wit might have been more recondite or quaint, but could never have expanded into such full, rosy dimensions. Without being egotistical, there was a perpetual comparison between himself and his friends; an amiable insolence of superiority which his very bulk and loud voice seemed to authorize. His wonderful spirits made all this natural. He was conscious of them, and thanks God who made him poor, that he made him merry. And again: 'I who have never had a house or land, or a farthing to spare, am sometimes mad with spirits, and must talk or burst.' They were like the 'joyousness and playfulness of a schoolboy;' his gaiety so irresistible and infectious as to carry everything before it. He owned to a love of noise, and must have raised the standard of sound consider-

ably wherever he was. 'Most London dinners,' he says, 'evaporate in whispers to one's next door neighbour. I make it a rule never to speak a word to mine, but fire across the table.' And speaking of some fine friends paying a visit, his comment is, 'And superfine work there will be, and much whispering, so that a blind man should sit there, and believe they are all gone to bed, though the room is full of the most brilliant company! As for me, I like a little noise and nature, and a large party very merry and happy.' Triumphant in his own exuberant organ, feebleness of voice was a source of amusement to him:—

'Some one, speaking of the character and writings of Mr. —: "Yes, I have the greatest possible respect for him; but from his feeble voice, he always reminds me of a liberal blue-bottle fly. He gets his head down and his hand on your button, and pours into you an uninterrupted stream of Whiggism in a low buzz. I have known him intimately, and conversed constantly with him for the last thirty years, and give him credit for the most enlightened mind, and a genuine love of public virtue; but I can safely say, that during that period I have never heard one single syllable he has uttered."—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 336.

A friend writes of him:—

'It signified not what the materials were: I never remember a dull dinner in his company. He extracted amusement from every subject, however hopeless. He descended and adapted himself to the meanest capacity, without seeming to do so; he led without seeking to lead; he never sought to shine—the light appeared because he could not help it. Nobody felt excluded. He had the happy art of always saying the best thing in the best manner to the right person at the right moment; it was a touch-and-go impossible to describe, guided by such tact and attention to the feelings of others, that those he most attacked seemed most to enjoy the attack: never in the same mood for two minutes together, and each mood seemed to be more agreeable than the last. "I talk a little sometimes," said he, "and it used to be an amusement amongst the servants at the Archbishop of York's, to snatch away my plate when I began talking; so I got a habit of holding it with one hand when so engaged, and dining at single anchor."—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp. 374, 375.

He was always amusing and easy in talking of himself, and advocated egotism in letters, though he is no example of it:—

'You never say a word of yourself, dear Lady Grey. You have that dreadful sin of anti-egotism. When I am ill, I mention it to all my friends and relations, to the lord-lieutenant of the county, the justices, the bishop, the churchwardens, the booksellers and editors of the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. p. 438.

His description of himself is that he 'lives with open doors and windows,' and may be seen as well in five minutes as in five years. His consciousness of his own powers sometimes transpired pleasantly, as where he forgot his name, and was so glad to find out who he was:—

'The oddest instance of absence of mind happened to me once in forgetting my own name. I knocked at a door in London; asked, "Is Mrs. B— at home?" "Yes, Sir; pray what name shall I say?" I looked in the man's face astonished:—what name? what name? ay, that is the question; what is my name? I believe the man thought me mad; but it is literally true, that during the space of two or three minutes I had no more idea who I was than if I had never existed. I did not know whether I was a Dissenter or a layman. I felt as dull as Sternhold and Hopkins. At last, to my great relief, it flashed across me that I was Sydney Smith.'—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp. 366, 367.

Or where he feels the perplexing pains of stupidity:—

'Now, I mean not to drink one drop of wine to-day, and I shall be mad with spirits. I always am when I drink no wine. It is curious the effect a thimbleful of wine has upon me; I feel as flat as —'s jokes; it destroys my understanding: I forget the number of the Muses, and think them thirty-nine of course; and only get myself right again by repeating the lines, and finding "Descend, ye thirty-nine!" two feet too long.'—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 375.

The assumption of good looks must needs belong to so joyous a spirit. A satire was published on the Edinburgh Reviewers:

'One of the charges against me is, I understand, that I am ugly; but this is a mere falsehood, and a plain proof that the gentleman never can have seen me. I certainly am the best-looking man concerned with the Review, and this John Murray has been heard to say behind my back.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. p. 12.

And he had a story of an encounter in a coach to the same effect:—

'When I was going to Brougham Hall, two raw Scotch girls got into the coach in the dark, near Carlisle. "It is very disagreeable getting into a coach in the dark," exclaimed one, after arranging her handboxes; "one cannot see one's company." "Very true, Ma'am, and you have a great loss in not seeing me, for I am a remarkably handsome man." "No, Sir! are you really?" said both. "Yes, and in the flower of my youth." "What a pity!" said they. We soon passed near a lamp-post: they both darted forward to get a look at me. "La, Sir, you seem very stout." "Oh no, not at all, Ma'am, it's only my great coat." "Where are you going, Sir?" "To Brougham Hall." "Why, you must be a very remarkable man, to be going to Brougham Hall." "I am a very remarkable man, Ma'am." At Penrith they got out, after having talked incessantly, and tried every possible means to discover who I was, exclaiming as they went off laughing, "Well, it is very provoking we can't see you, but we'll find out who you are at the ball; Lord Brougham always comes to the ball at Penrith, and we shall certainly be there, and shall soon discover your name."—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 184.

His size is, of course, another theme; and one of his latest jokes is to Lady Carlisle, on his reduced proportions. 'I look as if a curate had been taken out of me.' He took to riding in Yorkshire, but seems to have shown more courage than skill in the art:—

'My father at this period was in the habit of riding a good deal; but, either from the badness of his horses or the badness of his riding, or

perhaps from both (in spite of his various ingenious contrivances to keep himself in the saddle), he had several falls, and kept us in continual anxiety. He writes, in a letter, "I used to think a fall from a horse dangerous, but much experience has convinced me to the contrary. I have had six falls in two years, and just behaved like the three per cents. when they fall,—I got up again, and am not a bit the worse for it, any more than the stock in question." In speaking of this, he says, "I left off riding, for the good of my parish and the peace of my family; for, somehow or other, my horse and I had a habit of parting company. On one occasion I found myself suddenly prostrate in the streets of York, much to the delight of the Dissenters. Another time, my horse Calamity flung me over his head into a neighbouring parish, as if I had been a shuttlecock, and I felt grateful it was not into a neighbouring planet; but as no harm came of it, I might have persevered perhaps, if, on a certain day, a Quaker tailor from a neighbouring village, to which I had said I was going to ride, had not taken it into his head to call, soon after my departure, and request to see Mrs. Sydney. She instantly, conceiving I was thrown, if not killed, rushed down to the man, exclaiming, 'Where is he? where is your master? Is he hurt?' The astonished and quaking snip stood silent from surprise. Still more agitated by his silence, she exclaimed, 'Is he hurt? I insist upon knowing the worst.' 'Why, please, ma'am, it is only my little bill, a very small account, I wanted thee to settle,' replied he, in much surprise. After this, you may suppose, I sold my horse; however, it is some comfort to know that my friend Sir George is one fall ahead of me, and is certainly a worse rider. It is a great proof, too, of the liberality of this county, where everybody can ride as soon as they are born, that they tolerate me at all."—*Memoir*, vol. i. pp. 173—175.

He generally had some one subject of banter with his friends. With Jeffrey it was his smallness, on which he indulged in extreme hyperbole. 'Are we to see you?' he asks,—'a difficult thing at all times to do;'—or, 'The Swintons are come to town, and are to bring me your portrait—as large as life, I presume, as Mr. S. says in his note, "I will put in my pocket a little parcel I have for you."' And when he gets preferment, he writes: 'I cannot say the pleasure it gives me that my old dear friend Jeffrey is in the road to preferment. I shall not be easy till he is fairly on the Bench. His robes will cost him little; one buck rabbit will clothe him to the heels.' And remonstrating with him on some anti-Christian article that had appeared in the Edinburgh. 'Magnitude to you, my dear Jeffrey, must be such an intoxicating idea, that I have no doubt you would rather be gigantic in your errors, than immense in no respect whatsoever.' With Horner, the theme was his gravity and profundity: 'Horner is so extremely serious about the human race, that I am forced to compose my face half a street off before I meet with him.' . . . Again, 'Horner is ill. He was desired to read amusing books. Upon searching his library, it appeared he had no amusing books—the nearest of any work of that description being "*The Indian Trader's complete Guide*."' He had been successful in renting a house and disposing of his poultry, and tells Lady Holland,

'I attribute my success in these matters to having read half a volume of Adam Smith early in the summer, and to hints that have dropped from Horner, in his playful moods, upon the subject of sale and barter.' And in a letter to Jeffrey he says: 'I shall never apologize to you for egotism; I think very few men, writing to their friends, have enough of it. If Horner were to break fifteen of his ribs, or marry, or resolve to settle in America, he would never mention it to his friends; but would write with the most sincere kindness from Kentucky, to inquire for your welfare, leaving you to marvel as you chose at the post-mark, and to speculate whether it was Kentucky or Kensington.' The idea suggested by Macaulay, for whom he had a great admiration, was always, his powers of talking and his evident pleasure in exercising this gift. In speaking of him—'Oh, yes! we both talk a great deal, but I don't believe Macaulay ever did hear my voice. Sometimes, when I have told a good story, I have thought to myself—'Poor Macaulay! he will be very sorry some day to have missed hearing that!' He was always greatly impressed by Macaulay's attainments: 'There are no limits to his knowledge on small subjects as well as great; he is like a book in breeches. Yes, I agree he is certainly more agreeable since his return from India. His enemies might have said before (though I never did so) that he talked rather too much; but now he has *occasional flashes of silence* that make his conversation perfectly delightful.'

Mr. Luttrell is perpetually referred to for his knowledge and appreciation of the gastronomic art. At one time, this old friend, on his arrival at Bowood, has a forced smile on his countenance, seeming to intimate plain roast and boiled—a sort of apple-pudding depression, as if he had been staying with a clergyman; at another, 'having thought about salads much,' he looks forward to a talk on the subject with Luttrell and Lady Holland; and on another occasion he writes: 'Luttrell came over for the day. He was very agreeable, but spoke too lightly, I thought, of veal soup. I took him aside, and reasoned the matter with him, but in vain. To speak the truth, Luttrell is not steady in his judgment upon dishes. Individual failures with him degenerate into generic objections, till by some fortunate accident he eats himself into better opinions. A person of more calm reflection thinks not only of what he is consuming at the moment, but of the soups of the same kind he has met with in a long course of dining, and which have gradually and justly elevated the species. I am perhaps making too much of this; but the failures of a man of sense are always painful.'

If we are to believe his own evidence, this was a subject only

too interesting to himself. It was a theory of his that all ladies and gentlemen ate a great deal too much; and he gives his friends the result of a calculation on his own account, in which he found that between the ages of ten and seventy he had eaten and drunk forty-four horse-wagon-loads of meat and drink more than would have preserved him in life and health, which he estimated at 7,000*l.* sterling, assuring his correspondent that *he* would probably have to add another horse to his wagons. Acting on this warning, we find in one letter: 'I have had no gout, or any symptom of it: by eating little, and drinking only water, I keep body and mind in a serene state, and spare the great toe. Looking back at my past life, I find all my miseries proceed from indigestion. Young people in early life should be thoroughly taught the moral, intellectual, and physical evils of indigestion.' 'I fully intended,' he said, 'going to America; but my parishioners held a meeting, and came to a resolution that they could not trust me with canvas-backed ducks; and I felt they were right, so gave up the project.'

His cautions to all his friends while in this contrite and abstemious mood, are of the most faithful character. 'And now, Sir George, let me caution you against indulgence in that enormous appetite of yours. You eat every day as much as four men in holy orders,—yourself a layman!'

His love of cheerfulness showed itself in all his tastes. He was passionately fond of brightness, encouraged his children to deck themselves in flowers, covered his walls with pictures for the sake of the frames, bound his books in the gayest bindings, had large fires and as much light always as he could afford. At Foston he tried to indulge this taste cheaply, and was full of experiments at one time to burn the fat of his own sheep in little tins instead of candles. 'Great the illumination, and greater the smells,' that were the result. The discovery of gas enchanted him. After a course of visits, he writes to Lady Mary Bennett:—

'From thence to Lambton. And here I ask, what use of wealth so luxurious and delightful as to light your house with gas? What folly to have a diamond necklace or a Correggio, and not to light your house with gas! The splendour and glory of Lambton Hall make all other houses mean. How pitiful to submit to a farthing-candle existence, when science puts such intense gratification within your reach! Dear lady, spend all your fortune in a gas-apparatus. Better to eat dry bread by the splendour of gas, than to dine on wild beef with wax-candles.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. pp. 222, 223.

And for the same reason he admired French furnishing.

'The French certainly understand the art of furnishing better than we do; the profusion of glass in their rooms gives such gaiety. I remember entering a room with glass all round it, at the French Embassy, and saw

myself reflected on every side. I took it for a meeting of the clergy, and was delighted of course.'—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 382.

All aids to conversation he valued; but this was the only amusement he cared for. He hated theatricals, public or private, and he writes, in answer to some accounts of gaieties:—

'You seem to have had a very amusing life, with singing and dancing; but you cannot excite my envy by all your descriptions of dramas and melodramas; you may as well paint the luxuries of barley-meal to a tiger, or turn a leopard into a field of clover. All this class of pleasures inspires me with the same nausea as I feel at the sight of rich plum-cake or sweat-meats; I prefer the driest bread of common life.'

Music he had a certain modified taste for, but all performances of any length were odious to him.

'Nothing can be more disgusting than an oratorio. How absurd, to see five hundred people fiddling like madmen about the Israelites in the Red Sea! Lord Morpeth pretends to say he was pleased, but I see a great change in him since the music-meeting. Pray tell Luttrell he did wrong not to come to the music. It tired me to death; it would have pleased him.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. p. 238.

'All the branches of the Howards are at Castle Howard. The music went off very well; 20,500*l.* was collected. I did not go once. Music for such a length of time (unless under sentence of a jury) I will not submit to. What pleasure is there in pleasure, if quantity is not attended to, as well as quality? I know nothing more agreeable than a dinner at Holland House; but it must not begin at ten in the morning, and last till six. I should be incapable for the last four hours of laughing at Lord Holland's jokes, eating Raffaele's cakes, or repelling Mr. Allen's attacks upon the Church.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. p. 148, 149.

Nor had he any more taste for a lighter style if it involved an equal length of attention.

'My dear Lady Holland, I have not the heart, when an amiable lady says, "Come to 'Semiramis' in my box," to decline; but I get bolder at a distance. "Semiramis" would be to me pure misery. I love music very little,—I hate acting; I have the worst opinion of Semiramis herself, and the whole thing (I cannot help it) seems so childish and so foolish that I cannot abide it. Moreover, it would be rather out of etiquette for a Canon of St. Paul's to go to an opera; and where etiquette prevents me from doing things disagreeable to myself, I am a perfect martinet.

'All these things considered, I am sure you will not be a Semiramis to me, but let me off.'—*Memoir*, vol. ii. p. 478.

He was impatient of all kinds of lengthiness and tediousness. In the country, at home with his children, he never sat a moment after dinner, but hurried off with them to the garden or farm; retaining weary recollections of his father's tyranny in this respect, who dined at three, and always sat at table till dark, expecting his family to sit with him. The impression left by these long twilight sittings might have something to do with his taste for breakfast parties, though the alleged reason for it was 'that nobody is conceited before one o'clock.' He had a nervous dread of the prolixity of age stealing upon himself. 'I

'hope somebody will tell me when I grow old and prosy; though, 'I am not likely to get very prosy, I'm in general so short.' His sensations towards bores have been so vigorously expressed that we must extract them; though it was an infliction to which he was not often subject, his own presence and influence having a counteracting tendency. It occurs in his review of 'Granby,' and is *apropos* to one of the characters:—

'Lord Chesterton we have often met with, and suffered a good deal from his lordship:—a heavy, pompous, middling peer, occupying a great share in the conversation, saying things in ten words which required only two, and evidently convinced that he is making a great impression:—a large man, with a large head, and a very landed manner; knowing enough to torment his fellow-creatures, not to instruct them—the ridicule of young ladies, and the natural butt and target of wit. It is easy to talk of carnivorous animals and beasts of prey; but does such a man, who lays waste a whole party of civilized beings by prosing, reflect upon the joy he spoils, and the misery he creates in the course of his life; and that any one who listens to him through politeness would prefer toothache or earache to his conversation? Does he consider the extreme uneasiness which ensues when the company have discovered a man to be an extremely absurd person, at the same time that it is absolutely impossible to convey by words or manner the most distant suspicion of the discovery? And then, who punishes this bore? What sessions, what assizes for him? What bill is found against him? Who indicts him? When the judges have gone their vernal and autumnal rounds, the sheepstealer disappears, the swindler gets ready for the Bay, the solid parts of the murderer are preserved in anatomical collections; but after twenty years of crime the bore is discovered in the same house, in the same attitude, eating the same soup—unpunished, untried, undissected—no scaffold, no skeleton, no mob of gentlemen and ladies to gape over his last dying speech and confession.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 276.

His wit was, on the whole, free from what the stricter sort of critics would call the vice of punning—that is, his talent lay in finding resemblances in *ideas*, not in *words*. The process was a purely intellectual one; he was not often guided to his *bon mot* by *sound*. We are not depreciating puns—we have a great respect for good ones; which, indeed, sanctioned as they are by the practice of so many wits, from Shakspeare to Charles Lamb, need no defence of ours. But whatever his conversation might furnish, we observe this absence in his letters and reputed good sayings. Some few exceptions of course there are: as where he thanks a friend for some herrings, and asks how they are to be *dressed*. 'But perhaps I mistake, and they are to be eaten *naked*;' but the rule is an absence of puns.

His habits of composition were what might be expected from the fact of his excelling equally as a writer and a talker—he was rapid and certain.

'When he had any subject in hand, he was indefatigable in reading, searching, inquiring, seeking every source of information, and discussing it with any man of sense or cultivation who crossed his path. But having

once mastered it, he would sit down, and you might see him committing his ideas to paper with the same rapidity that they flowed out in his conversation,—no hesitation, no erasures, no stopping to consider and round his periods, no writing for effect, but a pouring out of the fulness of his mind and feelings, for he was heart and soul in whatever he undertook. One could see by his countenance how much he was interested or amused as fresh images came clustering round his pen; he hardly ever altered or corrected what he had written (as I find by many manuscripts I have of his); indeed, he was so impatient of this, that he could hardly bear the trouble of even looking over what he had written, but would not unfrequently throw the manuscript down on the table as soon as finished, and say, starting up, “*There, it is done; now, Kate, do look it over, and put in dots to the *i*'s and strokes to the *f*'s*”—and he would sally forth to his morning's walk.”—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 113.

He had extraordinary powers of abstraction: never needed a study, but wrote in the midst of his family.

‘His power of abstraction was so great that he would begin to compose, with as much rapidity and ease as another man would write a letter, those essays which are before the world, or some of those sermons of which my mother has given a few to the public since his death; often reading what he had written, listening to our criticisms (as Moliere did to his old woman), and this in the midst of all the conversation and interruptions of a family party, with talking or music going on.’—*Memoir*, vol. i. p. 116.

One characteristic rule of composition we find recorded: ‘In composing, as a general rule, run your pen through every other word you have written; you have no idea what vigour it will give your style.’ And in another place he gives a modest motive for his own invariable decision of language: ‘I write positively to avoid the long and circuitous language of diffidence, not because I attach any value to my opinions.’ Some amusing little hints show that his excellent style, straightforward and vigorous as it is, had not been attained without some study of elegance, as well as of clearness and precision—a fact which might be expected from his advice to young people to read a paper in the ‘Spectator’ every day, as he had done. ‘What a pretty name is Georgiana!’ he writes to Miss Harcourt, owner of that name; ‘many people would say, what a pretty name Georgiana is! but this would be inelegant; and it is more tolerable to be slovenly in dress than in style. Dress covers the mortal body, and adorns it, but style is the vehicle of the spirit.’ He has to defend his articles to Jeffrey, which he does with spirit, though always modestly, yielding the palm of depth and learning to him.

‘You must consider that Edinburgh is a very grave place, and that you live with philosophers who are very intolerant of nonsense. I write for the London, not for the Scotch market, and perhaps more people read my nonsense than your sense. The complaint was loud and universal of the extreme dulness and lengthiness of the “Edinburgh Review.” Too much, I admit, would not do of my style; but the proportion in which it exists

enlivens the Review, if you appeal to the whole public, and not to the eight or ten grave Scotchmen with whom you live. I am a very ignorant, frivolous, half-inch person; but, such as I am, I am sure I have done your Review good, and contributed to bring it into notice. Such as I am, I shall be, and cannot promise to alter. Such is my opinion of the effect of my articles. . . . Almost any one of the sensible men who write for the Review would have written a much wiser and more profound article than I have done upon the Game Laws. I am quite certain nobody would obtain more readers for his essay upon such a subject; and I am equally certain that the principles are *right*, and that there is no lack of sense in it.—*Memoir*, vol. ii. pp. 181, 182.

He always feels the contrast of style and thought between himself and his Scotch allies. 'Jeffrey,' he writes, 'has been here with his adjectives, who always travel with him.' 'Don't get into scrapes by phrases,' he says to another; and their metaphysics were a constant source of diversion to him. 'I take the liberty 'to send you two brace of grouse,' he writes to Lady Holland, 'curious because killed by a Scotch metaphysician; in other 'and better language, they are mere ideas, shot by other ideas, 'out of a pure intellectual notion called a gun.'

As a critic—and being an Edinburgh reviewer he was such by profession—his pretensions do not stand high: 'lightness and flimsiness,' he says, 'were his style of reviewing;' but even thus far his judgment could not be depended on. He thought dull books interesting when his prejudices were concerned; over-estimated clever ones of his own party or views, and disparaged talent on the opposite side. We learn from these volumes what a kind of literary tyranny is exercised by intellectual cliques. He was aware of this, and his natural candour strove against it. 'I have not read the review of Wordsworth,' he says to Jeffrey, 'because the subject is to me so very uninteresting; but, may 'I ask, do not such repeated attacks upon a man wear in some 'little degree the shape of persecution?' And of one of Walter Scott's early novels he writes to Lady Mary Bennett: 'There 'is great difference of opinion about Scott's new novel. At 'Holland House it is much run down: I dare not oppose my 'opinion to such an assay or proof-house; but it made me cry 'and laugh very often, and I was very sorry when it was over; 'and so I cannot, in conscience, call it dull.'

It is curious, and a testimony to his high estimate of female talent, though certainly not to his discernment, that he thought 'Waverley,' which he much admired, was written by a woman—Miss Scott, of Ancram. When he defines what a book ought to be, instead of pronouncing what it is, he is on safe ground. Witness the following definition of a good novel:—

'The main question as to a novel is—Did it amuse? Were you surprised at dinner coming so soon? Did you mistake eleven for ten, and twelve for eleven? Were you too late to dress? and did you sit up beyond your usual

hour? If a novel produces these effects, it is good; if it does not, strong language, love, scandal itself, cannot save it. It is only meant to please; and it must do that, or it does nothing. Now, "Granby" seems to us to answer this test extremely well; it produces unpunctuality, makes the reader too late for dinner, impatient of contradiction, and inattentive, even if a bishop is making an observation, or a gentleman lately from the Pyramids or the Upper Cataracts is let loose upon the drawing-room. The objection, indeed, to these compositions, when they are well done, is, that it is impossible to do anything, or perform any human duty, while we are engaged in them. Who can read Mr. Hallam's "Middle Ages," or extract the root of an impossible quantity, or draw up a bond, when he is in the middle of Mr. Trebeck and Lady Charlotte Duncan? How can the boy's lesson be heard, about the Jove-nourished Achilles, or his six miserable verses upon Dido be corrected, when Henry Granby and Mr. Courtenay are both making love to Miss Ornym? Common life palls in the middle of these artificial scenes. All is emotion when the book is open—all dull, flat, and feeble, when it is shut.'—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 263.

One amiable feature was his appreciation of the female character, and love of the society of women. More than half of his published letters are addressed to ladies, who, perhaps, in gratitude for his preference, preserved them with greater care than his male correspondents, or himself indeed; for he set so little store by his own letters, that on receiving a large packet of them from the heirs of Sir James Mackintosh, he burnt them all. He had the highest estimate of the understanding of woman; even in one of his articles asserting their inherent equality with the other sex. And he showed his sincerity by making them the recipients alike of his most serious and brightly playful thoughts. His delicate flattery, and tone of affectionate paternal gallantry, give quite a tender interest to his correspondence. Nor were his sympathies only with the young and beautiful. It was an axiom with him that a woman must *either* talk wisely or look well; but good sense, and a ready appreciation of his humour, were the surest roads to his favour. The peculiarly feminine accomplishment of directing society and harmonizing all its elements, would be valued to its utmost worth by him. He was able to understand and appreciate their moral virtues and characteristic domestic excellences, but the drawing-room was the arena in which he most naturally viewed them; it was their inestimable importance in the great scene of society which secured them their high place in his regard.

Society was his world, London his universe. Compelled for a great part of his life to live in the country, he never for a moment got naturalized there. Persons who did not refresh their intellects by a visit to town regularly as the season came round, were objects of his contempt—that is, as far as contempt was natural to him. He thought he himself had been a loser, in which he was no doubt greatly mistaken, by his life of com-

parative seclusion, 'being confined through the greater part of it to the society of the parish clerk,' instead of associating, as others of his friends did, with all best worth seeing and hearing. He was at home, indeed, with everybody and everywhere. He got on with country gentlemen and clergymen and farmers, and he could say truly he would not give a penny to avoid any man in England; but his heart turned to London. The eagerness with which he was sought there, the rush of invitations, the struggle for his society whenever it was known he was coming—every day being laid out weeks before his actual arrival, all make this natural in a man of his spirits and temperament, and country society might well seem flat after it. His tone towards country squires was uniformly supercilious. He despised their claims to descent. Their genealogy is 'a fortuitous concourse of noodles.' He had a standing quarrel with them on the subject of the game-laws, and his sarcasms on this question would not be more tolerable because they were deserved. He called them 'Live armiger spring-guns,' and speaks of those *feræ naturæ*, the lords of the manor; calling upon the Legislature to make just laws, and let squires live and die where they please. 'Depend upon it,' he writes, 'all lives 'out of London are mistakes, more or less grievous—but mistakes.' As he gets older, the feeling increases. He finds that the fifth act of life should be in great cities. He writes:—

'The summer and country have no charms for me. I look forward anxiously to the return of bad weather, coal-fires, and good society in a crowded city. I have no relish for the country; it is a kind of healthy grave. I am afraid you are not exempt from the delusion of flowers, green-turf, and birds; they all afford slight gratification, but not worth an hour of rational conversation, and rational conversation in sufficient quantities is only to be had from the congregation of a million people in one spot.'

And again:—

'You may laugh, but, after all, the country is most dreadful (he writes in December). The real use of it is to find food for cities; but as for a residence for any man who is neither butcher, nor baker, nor food-grower, in any of its branches, it is a dreadful waste of existence and abuse of life.'

It is curious to see how this favoured spot is the point of reference in all his thoughts, in its material buildings and as the centre of politics and society; how far soever his mind is transported by books, or science, or imagination, it cannot rest in the uncongenial region, but reverts to London life, and tests all by its standard. If he hears of savage life and its customs, he instantly subjects them to the test, and considers how they would do in Pall Mall, as where he announces that, 'A New Zealand attorney has come to London with 6s. 8d. tattooed all over his face.' And his jests of this sort on canni-

balism are familiar to all readers. Again he reviews a book on natural history, and is plunged into the woods of South America. The birds and beasts there become the actors in so many fables to illustrate social life. He cannot think of them for a moment without some human application.

'The toucan,' Mr. Waterton, observes, 'has an enormous bill, makes a noise like a puppy-dog, and lays his eggs in hollow trees. How astonishing are the freaks and fancies of nature! To what purpose, we say, is a bird placed in the woods of Cayenne, with a bill a yard long, making a noise like a puppy-dog, and laying eggs in hollow trees? The toucans, to be sure, might retort:—To what purpose were certain gentlemen in Bond-street created? To what purpose were certain foolish prating Members of Parliament created? pestering the House of Commons with their ignorance and folly, and impeding the business of the country. There is no end of such questions, so we will not enter into the metaphysics of the toucan.'—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 286.

The tortoise, he says, has two enemies, man and the boa-constrictor. The one roasts him; the boa-constrictor swallows him whole, shell and all, and consumes him slowly in the interior, as the Court of Chancery does a great estate. The sloth spends its life in trees, not *upon* the branches, but *under* them. 'He moves suspended, rests suspended, sleeps suspended, and passes his life in suspense, like a young clergyman distantly related to a bishop.' 'He comments on the campanero's note which may be heard three miles, this single little bird being more powerful than the belfry of a cathedral ringing for a new dean, just appointed on account of shabby politics, small understanding, and good family.' The wourali poison brings on a death resembling 'quiet apoplexy brought on by hearing a long story.' The vultures prey upon a dead snake. 'Mr. Waterton,' he tells us, 'did not observe that there was any division into Catholic and Protestant vultures, or that the majority of the flock thought it essentially vulturish to exclude one-third of their members from the blood and entrails.' The swarms of insect life in the same regions suggest no ideas but those of social inconvenience. There 'an insect with eleven legs is swimming in your tea-cup, a nondescript with nine wings is struggling in the small-beer, a caterpillar with several dozen eyes in his belly is hastening over the bread and butter.' At home he takes a child to see a turtle. The boy strokes the turtle's shell. 'Why are you doing that?' he asks. 'Oh! to please the turtle.' 'Why, child, you might as well stroke the dome of St. Paul's, to please the Dean and Chapter.' In the same spirit he rises to the sublime of hyperbole in summoning all the powers of the universe, and subduing them to be mere spectators and instruments of our state and passions: 'All the planets and comets mean to stop and look on at the first meeting of Parliament.' And, writing from London, Novem-

ber 1834, where his friends had just been worsted :—‘ Nothing can exceed the fury of the Whigs. They mean not only to change everything upon the earth, but to alter the tides, to suspend the principles of gravitation and vegetation, and to tear down the solar system.’

He was decidedly aristocratic in his tastes—perhaps all people are who have such unlimited choice of society as he had ; but he evidently expanded and breathed freer air in the society of people who were at the head of things, who knew everybody worth knowing, who governed the country or led the opposition, who had splendid town houses and a choice of noble country seats, and who ruled society. The easy, gracious manners of persons thus pleasantly situated suited his temperament. He was independent, and spoke his mind freely to them ; but, after all, such a mode of life had his hearty approbation, and the man whom he would have liked as a commoner he liked better as a lord. It was more in his way. As he says to a correspondent, of the Duchess of Bedford, ‘ All duchesses seem agreeable to clergymen ; but she would really be a very clever, agreeable woman, if she were married to a neighbouring vicar.’ Though a Whig, he had no notion of throwing open the government of the country to public competition. He could conceive nothing better than the rule of these realms being secured to the descendants of Russells and Greys to all time. ‘ Lady ——,’ he says, in one of his letters, ‘ is unwell, and expects to be confined in February. The public is indebted to every lady of fashion who brings a fresh Whig into the world.’ And to Lady Grey he writes, ‘ Talking of honest men, I beg to be remembered to Lord Howick, on whom I lay great stress, for his understanding, rank, and courage. He will be an important personage in the days to come. Pat him on the back, and tell him that the safety and welfare of a country depend in a great measure on men like himself.’ Often speaking and writing for reform, he thought the Reform Bill, when it came, much too sweeping. He was not a Free-trader, and he had a horror of the ballot, for one reason, as interfering with legitimate aristocratic influence. He was as great a partisan as is consistent with a perfect knowledge and candid avowal that he was such ; for he knew himself to be imbued with all the prejudices of his party. He liked the Whig leaders, their principles, many of their measures, and their kindness to and appreciation of himself. But his conduct to them is various. As his patrons and friends, he exhibits a peculiar felicity of flattery and compliment, quite sincere on his part ; but it is the client addressing his patron. On one subject, however, he had principles and jealousies of his own. When he became a Church dignitary,

he felt with his order; and when his friends the Whigs, amidst their many schemes for reform, proposed to reform Deans and Chapters, it is astonishing the new light in which he viewed things. No bigoted Tory ever showed himself more averse to change, more blindly conservative. He could see the necessity for change in every other department of the Establishment. Bishops and Universities must be sifted like wheat; but touch Deans and Chapters, interfere with their wealth and *prestige*, and immediately the Church was in danger. They were the prizes in the great lottery of Church preferment. No men superior either in rank or talent, without them, would enter so ill-paid an establishment. It would sink into contempt. Creeds and articles, we verily believe, were to him points of altogether minor importance. On this question, then, to which he applied himself with characteristic vigour, he addresses his old friends with tender petulance, and turns against them, and against himself in his new position, all the resources of his humorous pen. This situation of affairs drew from him some of his happiest portraits. That of Lord John Russell—though one passage of it is familiar to all the world—should yet be seen as a whole: this same Lord John to whom, in the Letters, we find him complacently assigning the task of ‘destroying the absurd Irish Church.’

‘Lord John Russell gives himself great credit for not having confiscated Church property, but merely remodelled and redivided it. I accuse him not of plunder, but I accuse him of taking the Church of England, rolling it about as a cook does a piece of dough with a rolling-pin, and cutting a hundred different shapes, with all the plastic fertility of the confectioner, and withal the most distant suspicion that he can ever be wrong, or can be mistaken; with a certainty that he can anticipate the consequences of every possible change in human affairs. There is not a better man in the world than Lord John Russell; but his worst failure is, that he is utterly ignorant of all moral fear; there is nothing he would not undertake. I believe he would perform the operation for the stone—build St. Peter’s—or assume (with or without ten minutes’ notice) the command of the Channel fleet; and no one would discover by his manner that the patient had died—the church tumbled down—and the Channel fleet been knocked to atoms. I believe his motives are always pure, and his measures often able; but they are endless, and never done with that pedetentous pace and pedetentous mind, in which it behoves the wise and virtuous improver to walk. He alarms the wise Liberals; and it is impossible to sleep soundly while he has the command of the watch.

‘Do not say, my dear Lord John, that I am too hard upon you. A thousand years have scarce sufficed to make our blessed England what it is; an hour may lay it in the dust: and can you, with all your talents, renovate its shattered splendour—can you recal back its virtues—can you vanquish time and fate? But, alas! you want to shake the world, and be the thunderer of the scene.’—*Works: Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton*, vol. iii. p. 113.

And to this ought to be appended the few lines, though suggested by another subject (the ballot), which complete his

estimate of the character, and have been shown to be appropriate to recent events :—

‘ In fact this sort of language (threatening to vote for ballot, though he hated it,) is utterly unworthy of the sense and courage of Lord John ; he gives hopes where he ought to create absolute despair. This is that hovering between two principles which ruins political strength by lowering political character, and creates a notion that his enemies need not fear such a man, and that his friends cannot trust him. No opinion could be more unjust towards Lord John ; but such an opinion will grow if he begins to value himself more upon his dexterity and finesse, than upon those fine manly historico-Russell qualities he must undoubtedly possess. There are two beautiful words in the English language—yes and no ; he must pronounce them boldly and emphatically ; stick to yes and no to the death ; for yes and no lay his head down upon the scaffold, where his ancestors have laid their heads before, and cling to his yes and no in spite of Robert Peel and John Wilson, and Joseph and Daniel, and Fergus and Stevens himself.’—Vol. iii. p. 24.

Then comes Lord Melbourne :—

‘ Viscount Melbourne declared himself quite satisfied with the Church as it is ; but if the public had any desire to alter it, they might do as they pleased. He might have said the same thing of the monarchy, or of any other of our institutions : and there is in the declaration a permissiveness and good humour, which in public men has seldom been exceeded. Carelessness however is but a poor imitation of genius, and the formation of a wise and well-reflected plan of Reform conduces more to the lasting fame of a minister, than all that affected contempt of duty which every man sees to be mere vanity, and a vanity of no very high description.

‘ But if the truth must be told, our Viscount is somewhat of an impostor—everything about him seems to betoken careless desolation : any one would suppose from his manner that he was playing at chuck-farthing with human happiness ; that he was always on the heel of pastime ; that he would giggle away the Great Charter, and decide by the method of teetotum, whether my Lords the Bishops should or should not retain their seats in the House of Lords. All this is the mere vanity of surprising, and making us believe that he can play with kingdoms as other men can with nine-pins. Instead of this lofty nebulo, this miracle of moral and intellectual felicities, he is nothing more than a sensible, honest man, who means to do his duty to the Sovereign and to the country, instead of being the ignorant man he pretends to be. Before he meets the deputation of tallow-chandlers in the morning, he sits up half the night talking with Thomas Young about melting and skimming, and then, though he has acquired knowledge enough to work off a whole vat of prime Leicester tallow, he pretends next morning not to know the difference between dip and mould. In the same way, when he has been employed in reading Acts of Parliament, he would persuade you that he has been reading *Cleghorn on the Beatitudes*, or *Pickler on the nine Difficult Points*. Neither can I allow to this minister (however he may be irritated by the denial) the extreme merit of indifference to the consequences of his measures. I believe him to be conscientiously alive to the good or evil that he is doing, and that his caution has more than once arrested the gigantic projects of the Lycurgus of the Lower House. I am sorry to hurt any man's feelings, and to brush away the magnificent fabric of levity and gaiety he has reared ; but I accuse our minister of honesty and diligence. I deny that he is careless and rash : he

is nothing more than a man of good understanding and good principle, disguised in the eternal and somewhat wearisome affectations of a political *romé*.'—P. 93.

Nor can we omit the tone of testy soreness he assumes in this controversy, well aware that it would be attributed to him, and therefore ingeniously turning it to profit. It contains too a condensed account of his receipts from the Church:—

'You tell me I shall be laughed at as a rich and overgrown churchman. I have been laughed at a hundred times in my life, and care little or nothing about it. If I am well provided for now, I have had my full share of the blanks in the lottery as well as the prizes. Till thirty years of age I never received a farthing from the church—then 50*l.* per annum for two years—then nothing for ten years—then 500*l.* per annum, increased for two or three years to 800*l.*, till in my grand climacteric I was made Canon of St. Paul's; and before that period I had built a parsonage-house, with farm-offices for a large farm, which cost me 4,000*l.*, and had reclaimed another from ruin at the expense of 2,000*l.* A lawyer or a physician in good practice would smile at this picture of great ecclesiastical wealth, and yet I am considered a perfect monster of ecclesiastical prosperity.

'I should be very sorry to give offence to the dignified ecclesiastics who are in the commission; I hope they will allow for the provocation, if I have been a little too warm in the defence of St. Paul's, which I have taken a solemn oath to defend. I was at school and college with the Archbishop of Canterbury; fifty-three years ago he knocked me down with a chess-board for check-mating him, and now he is attempting to take away my patronage. I believe these are the only two acts of violence he ever committed in his life: the interval has been one of gentleness, kindness, and the most amiable and high-principled courtesy to his clergy. * * * As for my friends the Whigs, I neither wish to offend them nor anybody else. I consider myself to be as good a Whig as any amongst them. I was a Whig before many of them were born, and while some of them were Tories and waverers. I have always turned out to fight their battles, and when I saw no other clergyman out but myself—and this in times before liberality was well recompensed, and therefore in fashion, and when the smallest appearance of it seemed to condemn a churchman to the grossest obloquy, and the most hopeless poverty. It may suit the purpose of the ministers to flatter the bench; it does not suit mine. I do not choose in my old age to be tossed as a prey to the bishops; I have not deserved this from my Whig friends. I know very well there can be no justice for Deans and Chapters, and that the momentary lords of the earth will receive our statement with derision and *persiflage*, the great principle which is now called in for the government of mankind.'—*First Letter to Archdeacon Singleton: Works*, p. 79.

On the question of Roman Catholic emancipation he had treated very lightly the question of the king's oath, on which the opponents of that measure laid great stress. It was never intended that the king should go by his individual judgment, but by the opinions of those best qualified to judge, &c. But on this question his view of an oath is altogether different. The archbishop had taken an oath to preserve the rights and property of the Church of Canterbury, and now it is an imperiously binding engagement. 'In spite of his uplifted chess-board, he must harp a little upon the oath.'

'A friend of mine has suggested to me that his grace has perhaps forgotten the oath; but this cannot be, for the first Protestant in Europe of course makes a memorandum in his pocket-book of all the oaths he takes, to do, or to abstain. The oath, however, may be less present to the Archbishop's memory from the fact of his not having taken the oath in person, but by the medium of a gentleman sent down in the coach to take it for him; a practice which, though I believe it to have been long established in the church, surprised me not a little. A proxy to vote, if you please—a proxy to consent to arrangements of estates, if wanted—but a proxy sent down in the Canterbury fly, to take the Creator to witness that the archbishop, detained in town by business or pleasure, will never violate that foundation of piety over which he presides—all this seems to me an act of the most extraordinary indolence ever recorded in history. * * *

'I have been informed, though I will not answer for the accuracy of the information, that this vicarious oath is likely to produce a scene which would have puzzled the *Ductor Dubitantium*. The attorney who took the oath for the Archbishop is, they say, seized with religious horrors at the approaching confiscation of Canterbury property, and has in vain tendered back his 6s. 8d. for taking the oath. The Archbishop refuses to accept it; and feeling himself light and disencumbered, wisely keeps the saddle upon the back of the writhing and agonized scrivener. I have talked it over with several clergymen, and the general opinion is that the scrivener will suffer.'—*Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton: Works*, vol. iii. p. 99.

It was a sore point with Sydney Smith that he was not made a bishop. How far this fact affected his language towards the bench, as knowing that they would object to such an anomalous associate, he himself probably could not judge. In middle life he would have liked the office, and probably expected it. He admits to his friends that he now and then sees crosiers in the clouds, and assures Lady Holland (strange confidant!) when her husband is in power in 1808, that if he is chosen bishop he will never do them discredit; it being out of the power of lawn and velvet, and the crisp hair of dead men fashioned into a wig, to make him a dishonest man. Jestings allusions to this subject abound in his correspondence. But time passes—and thirty years later he probably really felt what he said, that the 'pomp, trifles, garments, and ruinous expense of the episcopal life' would make him dread it. Still he conceived himself ill-used—he felt a slight was passed upon him by his old friends whom he had amused so long. Perhaps his own precept rose up against him, 'Do not attempt to be more amusing and agreeable than is consistent with the preservation of respect.' He thought the Whigs cowardly, that they dare not confer this 'reward,' on their staunchest and ablest clerical ally. He certainly had no cause to suppose any conscientious objection; nor was there any. His daughter has reason to know that Lord Grey wished it. Lord Melbourne was heard to say that 'there was nothing he more deeply regretted in looking back on 'his past career than the not having made Sydney Smith a 'bishop.' And Lord John writes to him, 'I think you are quite

'right not to be ambitious of the prelacy, as it would lead to much disquiet for you; but if I had entirely my own way in these matters, you should have the opportunity of refusing.' This sentence is from a correspondence on this subject which we are led to infer passed between Sydney Smith and Lord John in 1837. Some one (perhaps, the archbishop) had evidently objected, and brought a charge or suspicion of heterodoxy against our friend, and Lord John had dropped a hint to this effect. We wish his ground of denial and contradiction had not been so purely negative a one.

'I know not, by alluding to the chess-board, whether you mean the charges which — might make against me, or against liberal men in general. I defy — to quote a single passage of my writing contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England; for I have always avoided speculative, and preached practical, religion. I defy him to mention a single action in my life which he can call immoral. The only thing he could charge me with, would be high spirits, and much innocent nonsense. I am distinguished as a preacher, and sedulous as a parochial clergyman. His real charge is, that I am a high-spirited, honest, uncompromising man, whom all the bench of Bishops could not turn, and who would set them all at defiance upon great and vital questions. This is the reason why (as far as depends upon others) I am not a bishop; but I am thoroughly sincere in saying I would not take any bishopric whatever, and to this I pledge my honour and character as a gentleman. But, had I been a bishop, you would have seen me, on a late occasion, charging — and — with a gallantry which would have warmed your heart's blood, and made Melbourne rub the skin off his hands.

'Pretended heterodoxy is the plea with which the Bishops endeavoured to keep off the bench every man of spirit and independence, and to terrify you into the appointment of feeble men, who will be sure to desert you (as all your bishops have lately and shamefully done) in a moment of peril. When was there greater clamour excited than by the appointment of —, or when were there stronger charges of heterodoxy? Lord Grey disregarded all this, and they are forgotten.'—Vol. ii. pp. 399, 400.

Such insights as these into Church politics are little edifying to the people at large. No comments of ours are needed; they may be inferred from the general tenor of our remarks.

However, though he missed the bishopric which he regarded as a sort of crowning temporal good, his career was a singularly prosperous one. Most acknowledged wits have found this faculty to bring them, through their abuse of it, days of poverty and dejection in return for hours of feverish fitful triumph. They amused others at the expense of their own happiness and self-respect—they have been losers in health, independence, temper, and prospects. Sydney Smith's wit, on the contrary, advanced and sustained his interests more surely than the most plodding good qualities and faculties could have done. It brought him first competence, and afterwards affluence. It was a never-failing source of enjoyment to himself, and procured him the society and highest consideration of the great and distinguished.

While others have felt their powers decline, and their influence fail, as age came on, he retained all the resources of his mind unimpaired, and his wit as bright and keen as in his youth. His old age was as much courted as his prime of manhood. His pen never effected his purpose better, and never made a greater impression, than in his last employment of it, within the latest year of his life, when he roused the whole American nation to honest shame or impotent rage by his attack on the Pennsylvanians and other repudiating states. His domestic life, except for the death of his son, was unclouded. He had a devoted wife who survived him, and affectionate daughters; a flock of flourishing grandchildren, whom he delighted to assemble about him, and troops of friends.

But it is more than time to draw our remarks to a close. There is something ungracious in subjecting a wit to the tests and ordeals of serious sober humanity, at least while we do so, because we must not forget the solemn obligations of that calling with which such brilliant and volatile talents were associated, we may bear in mind his singular temptations, and the overpowering supremacy wit like his is likely to obtain over the other faculties. What additional difficulty must there be, in seeing things in their solemn aspect, to the intellect whose first instinct is to treat every fresh idea after its own familiarising process; where a rush of startling comparisons throw thought off its balance, and the mind is entertained before it can be impressed. Not that we would find excuses or palliation for what is wrong, or for that low tone towards spiritual things which pervades Sydney Smith's words and writings; but in estimating every character, justice demands that its peculiar circumstances must be taken into account. Whether he was better or worse for his ill-chosen profession, it is impossible to determine; he made, it is certain, a very indifferent divine, but probably he was a more respectable man, and such duties of his calling as he did perform could not fail to impart dignity, strength, and purpose to his being. It gave him an insight too into national and legal abuses which a busier or more idle life would neither of them have furnished. It brought him acquainted with the poor, and with the trials and oppressions to which bad laws exposed them, thus turning his hatred of injustice to good purpose, and sharpening his pen to seek and gain redress; that pen, to which at least one praise is due, that its keenest satire was never malignant, and that no stain of impurity ever sullied its wit.

ART. II.—1. *Ankündigung und Probe einer neuen Kritischen Ausgabe, und neuen Uebersetzung der Syrischen Chronik der Gregor Bar Hebræus.* VON GEORG. HEINRICH BERNSTEIN. Asher, Berlin. 1847.

2. *Prospectus and Specimen of a new Critical Edition and new Translation of the Syriac Chronicle of Gregory Bar Hebræus.* By GEORGE HENRY BERNSTEIN. Asher, Berlin. 1847.

EVERY reader of Gibbon is familiar with the name of Abulfaragius. It figures in almost every page of that vast repository of learning in which the author is obliged to touch on Oriental History, and forms, in fact, almost his chief, though not his exclusive, authority in that department. The form in which he consulted this writer was, doubtless, the well-known edition of Pocock, in Arabic and Latin, published under the title of *Historia Dynastiarum*. The book is not inviting, either externally or internally. It is an ugly square volume, and the information it contains appears to be presented in a repulsive typography and unengaging manner. But the Historian of the Decline and Fall contrived to elicit from it a vast store of Oriental information, which he has marshalled with that consummate skill by which he was in the habit of digesting into a lucid summary the long-winded Byzantine histories and the loose narrative of Oriental fabulists. It does not, as far as we know, appear that he ever consulted the Syriac edition of this work, although it was published some years before the last volumes of his History were finished. It contains, however, so large an accession of materials for history, that there are few subjects connected with the East, previously to the thirteenth century, on which he would not have gleaned a considerable harvest by consulting it. The first and, as yet, the only edition of the Syriac Chronicle of Abulfarage was published in the year 1788, under very peculiar circumstances. A German student of Civil Law, named Bruns, passed a considerable time at Oxford; and having in Germany acquired a competent knowledge of Syriac, he spent his leisure hours in copying the beautiful MS. of this author, belonging to the Bodleian Library. The work of transcription, creditable as the undertaking was to the zeal of the young student, was unhappily performed either with insufficient leisure, or without adequate skill for so important a task. But on the return of Bruns to Germany, his copy of this MS. created a considerable sensation, and he was earnestly entreated

to publish it. To these entreaties he yielded; but, alas! the necessity for a rapid completion of the work, added to a certain degree of inaccuracy in the Syriac knowledge of the editor, damaged very materially the value of the publication. In one respect, perhaps, the *extreme* haste with which the book was printed and published, ensured a greater degree of accuracy than would have been attained had a few more weeks been available. It was physically impossible for Bruns, single-handed, to bring out his volume in time for the Leipsic Book-fair of 1788; accordingly, he placed a considerable portion of his manuscript in the hands of Kirsch, by far the ablest Syriac scholar of that day. The consequence was, that one portion of the work, executed by Kirsch, is really well edited; and although a longer time would have enabled *him* to add materially to the value of his emendations of the text and his brief notes, we must rejoice that his aid was invoked. The Autobiography of Abulfarage, and some small portions of his numerous works, had appeared in the early part of the eighteenth century in the 'Bibliotheca Orientalis' of Assemani; but even those fragments of his Syriac writings were known only to a very limited circle of Orientalists. The publication of the 'Bibliotheca Orientalis' promoted very effectually the study of the Syriac language, but the number of students was small. This work, which is a Catalogue Raisonné of all the Syriac books in the Vatican, with copious extracts from many of them, was the means by which a far more extended knowledge of the vocabulary and the grammar of the language could be acquired than previously; but it did not excite a general interest. The nature of this work, and its expensive form, rendered it accessible to those only who were in affluent circumstances, or who were placed near a public library. And even the public libraries of Germany were not all furnished with this luxury. J. D. Michaelis, one of the most eminent Syriac scholars of the last century, complains, in more than one of his publications, of the hard fate of his father, because the library of the University of Halle was unprovided with this treasure. In his admirable 'Syriac Grammar' (A.D. 1784), which he calls a successor of the *Syriasmus* of his father, he excuses the deficiencies of the latter grammar, by observing that the University Library of Halle and his own private library were destitute of the 'B. O.' of Assemani, and the works of Ephrem Syrus. Again, in his edition of 'Castell's Syriac Lexicon,' he renews the same complaint about the '*perquam modica Bibliotheca Academica Hallensis.*' We are accustomed to look upon Halle as blazing with all the splendour of the names of Vater and Gesenius, who are as eminent in Philology, as they are contemptible in Theology; and we can hardly realize these facts, and

conceive the miserable discouragements under which these studies took their rise. It would hardly be credited, if it were not delivered on undoubted authority, that in the middle of the last century the Library of the University of Halle was unprovided with books, without which no progress can be made in Syriac beyond the mere study of the versions of the Bible. And yet from Halle have come Vater, Gesenius, and Rödiger, to whose labours Oriental Philology is so much indebted. We are informed on good authority, that when Gesenius began to lecture he had only fourteen auditors ! but after twenty years his class reached to five hundred auditors. He consoled himself about the small number of students at first, by the consideration that when Vater commenced his lectures, *he* had only four auditors ! So that, although we now address a small number of persons in England, that number may ere long be much increased. And while we make these few brief statements concerning Syriac literature in general, we desire more especially to call attention to the author we have named, viz., Abulfarage, or, as he is frequently called, Gregory Bar Hebræus. With this introduction, we enter upon the consideration of this author's Life and Works.

In the year 1847 a new edition of the Syriac Chronicle of this eminent man was projected in Germany. The Staatsrath D. von Frähn made a request that the German Oriental Society would undertake this labour. The work is dear and scarce ; it is full of important matter, not easily met with elsewhere ; and the only edition in existence is not only lamentably incorrect, but the mistakes in which it abounds are calculated to mislead all but first-rate scholars. These circumstances offer strong inducements for a new edition ; but that labour ought to be undertaken by an university or by some public body, like the Oriental Society, which can bear the outlay required without looking for an immediate return. The work will sell, if well executed, but its sale must necessarily be slow. The fact is, that the history of Abulfarage was only known to the learned by the Arabic edition, of which we have already spoken as a text-book to Gibbon. The Arabic text, however, was only an abridgement made by the author himself during the last year of his life ; and although it may contain some corrections and even additions, the main feature of the Arabic as compared with the Syriac form of the work is omission. The language of Michaelis as to the relative value of the two works is particularly strong. He says :¹—

¹ 'Abhandlung von der Syrischen Sprache, und ihrem Gebrauch ; nebst dem ersten Theil einer Syrischen Chrestomathie. Zweite Auflage, mit Zusätzen.' Göttingen. 1786.

‘But how important would it be if we had a greater number of entire Syriac works on history. I will only mention one, of which we possess a portion in Arabic extracts, and a Latin translation of them. Gregorius Abulpharagius, whose “*Historia Dynastiarum*” Ed. Pocock, published with a Latin translation, has hitherto been one of the chief sources of Oriental history. . . . But the book was originally written in Syriac, and was called a Chronicle. The Arabic is a mere translation, or to speak more correctly, a mere hasty abridgement of it, prepared by Bar Hebræus himself, at the request of some Arabians, and to which he did not, it appears, devote more than a month. But this translation by no means supersedes the utility of the Syriac original. For this consists of three parts, entitled by Assemani:—

‘“1. A Chronicle of the Scripture Patriarchs and Kings.

“2. A Chronicle of the Jacobite Patriarchs of Antioch.

“3. A Chronicle of the Primates, Patriarchs, and Maphrians of the East.”

‘Of these the last portion is entirely omitted in the Arabic, . . . nor is the first preserved entire. How great would be the gain to Asiatic history, which in the Middle Ages is much interwoven with European, especially Byzantine, as well as with the Crusades and Russian history, if we could read this author in the original. He is, of all the Syriac writers known to us, by far the most learned. His History was enriched with materials gathered from places now under the dominion of ignorance, and derived from the treasures of ancient libraries, apparently long since destroyed, particularly from the Syriac, Arabic, and Persian writings in the archives at Maruga, in the province of Adorbigan. . . . Gregory B. H. lived in a period of the greatest interest, viz. from A. D. 1226—1286, under the great Tatar monarch Hulaku (Holagou); and as his forefathers survived the conquest of Jenghiz Khan, so he survived the destruction of the Khalifat by Hulaku, a brother of Mangou. . . . Being Primate, he had the honour of being received by this great king, whose name, to the disgrace of historians, is unknown to many of them.’

Such is the opinion of a very competent judge, J. D. Michaelis, the author of the ‘*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*,’ and the ‘*Introduction to the New Testament*,’—two books which, though they are very questionable in their principles, are full of erudition.

The value of the Syriac text is even yet hardly appreciated, because it is known to us only (except in MS.) in a very corrupt condition. The learned Von Hammer (*Fundgruben des Orients*, v. p. 346) denies indeed that the Arabic is a mere hasty abridgement, and Bernstein considers it a revised and corrected edition of the first part of the Syriac Chronicle; but, after all, it is an historical fact that he was not employed more than a month on the translation, and there is no question that it is, in many places, considerably abridged. It is true, also, on the other hand, that some portions of the history are enlarged, but it happens to be in those parts where the subject-matter interests Europeans the least. As he composed his Arabic edition for the use of Mohammedans, he inserted fuller accounts of Scripture matter and Roman History, as these were things of which they were

likely to be rather ignorant; and he retrenched the history of the Khalif Hakem and of Saladin, because the Arabic reader was probably too well acquainted with this part of history to need his aid.

It has been intimated that the work in Syriac consists of two, or rather of three parts. These are:—

1. The General History.
2. The Ecclesiastical History, divided into two portions.

The former of these divisions has been edited in Arabic by Pocock, and in Syriac by Bruns and Kirsch; the latter is still unpublished.

As the author himself is not very extensively known to English readers, it may be convenient if we give a brief summary of his life, drawn from his own most interesting autobiography, which is found in the second volume of Assemanni's '*Bibliotheca Orientalis*.' Indeed the sketch of his life prefixed to Pocock's edition of the Chronicle is almost ludicrous, for its jejuneness and its inaccuracy. Pocock draws his information chiefly from Arabic writers, which accounts for the manner in which he speaks of the works of this author. He tells us that he wrote many books, but none of them were known to Pocock except the '*Historia Dynastiarum*' and a Syriac Grammar. He also states that Abulfarage¹ is reported to have died an apostate and a Mohammedan,—a tradition which Pocock refutes with some hesitation, although we must regard it in much the same light as we should look upon a respectable Hindoo scandal, that Bishop Heber had died a convert to the faith of Brahma.² Indeed, nothing can show more completely how ignorant our great Oriental scholars of the seventeenth century were of Syriac, than the explanation given by Pocock of the title borne by Abulfarage, viz. the 'Maphrian of the East.' This title—though it is as recognised a phrase for the second dignity in the Jacobite Church, as 'Metropolitan of England'³ is for the Archbishop of York—Pocock informs us means the 'Oriental Teacher.'

¹ The word is so differently spelt in different authors that one hardly knows how to recognise it under its various disguises. Abu'l'aradsch, Abu'l'araj, Abu'l'arage, Abulpharage, &c. are all found; and as we must adopt one, we have selected that which is most in accordance with common usage, though not the most correct.

² Assemanni supposes Pocock to have been misled by confusing our author with another Abufarage commemorated by Ibn Chalikan, B. O. vol. ii. p. 266. It is of little importance whether the assertion arose from such a mistake or not. The simple statement of the fact, without an indignant refutation of it, testifies the general ignorance of Syriac literature prevalent even among the literary giants of those days. The means of studying it were not accessible until Assemanni had published his '*Bibliotheca Orientalis*.'

³ As contrasted with 'Metropolitan of all England' for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Abulfarage was born in the year 1537 of the Greek era (by which the Syriac writers commonly reckon), and this corresponds with A.D. 1226. His father was a Jewish physician, named Aaron, from which circumstance he derives the patronymics by which he is often designated, of Bar-Hebraeus and Bar-Aaron. The notices of his youth are scanty, but he has given us full particulars of his episcopal life; and as the private memoirs of an Oriental Primate of the thirteenth century are not of every-day occurrence, the details of daily life and ecclesiastical history which they present contain some novelty and considerable interest. It must be premised that Abulfarage was of the sect of Monophysites or Jacobites. The highest dignity among these sectarians was that of Patriarch, but next to the Patriarch was the Primate or Metropolitan, whose proper title in Syriac is Maphrian or Mafrian,—a dignity to which our author finally attained. The period at which he was elected to this high office was a stormy season for the Christians in the East. Bagdad and Aleppo, as well as the greater portion of Syria, had been torn by convulsions, and the Mohammedans of Assyria had come with a fell swoop on the Christians of those regions only to make way for a still more devastating expedition under the Tatars.

'The Church,' observes Abulfarage, 'remained desolate and widowed for six years; for before the death of Salibo the Mafrian, it had been deprived of the Patriarch also for three years.' Ecclesiastical affairs were then in rather a perplexing condition in those regions. The dignitaries of the Church (or Churches, for there were the Orthodox Church, the Monophysite Sect, &c.) were obliged to ask for a confirmation of their office at the hands of the Tatar monarch, then called by them 'the King of Kings!' The monarch, however, to whom Abulfarage was referred in these affairs, appears to have conducted himself in a gentlemanly and kind manner. The condition of the Church is thus described:—

'At the time of the death of Ignatius, called also Salibo the Mafrian, these districts were much disturbed. Bagdad was desolated, then Aleppo, then Bethnahrin (Mesopotamia). And after this the Mohammedans of Assyria rose against the Christians, and destroyed them. And after a short time the Tatars came and killed the Mohammedans, and a general slaughter ensued.'

Notwithstanding this depressed and depressing condition, a synod of Jacobite Bishops met to elect a Patriarch and a Mafrian; and our author was the person selected for the latter dignity. This occurred in the year of the Greeks 1575 (*i.e.* A.D. 1264). His consecration was delayed a short time in consequence of the troubled state of the country, but in due time he was installed in his new dignity. The Mafrian now prepared, with his eccle-

siastical superior, the Patriarch, to visit 'the King of Kings,' i.e. Holagou or Hulaku (as he is called in these volumes), the chief of the Tatars; or, as one might say, the Great Mogul, from whom each of them received a diploma of confirmation. Some curious details are given in this portion of the autobiography of Abulfarage, as to the terms on which the rival sects conducted their affairs in the East at this season; but as they are scarcely of sufficient interest to justify quotation, we shall simply remark that they appear to be highly creditable to the Christian moderation and temper of all parties.

We must, however, contrive to make room for the following amusing account of

'THE MANAGEMENT OF A REFRACTORY BISHOP.'

'And in that year one Simeon, called also Bar-Kalig, who was Bishop of the city Tus in Khorassan, received an appointment from Mar Dencha, the Catholicus and Metropolitan of China; but as he showed symptoms of rebellion against the Catholicus before he set out for his see, the Catholicus sent for him, and having brought him to Asna, a city of Badurbigan, he despoiled him of all his property, and incarcerated him at once in the convent of Mar Abraham, in the suburbs of the city. From this he contrived to escape, and fled to the mountains, when he was brought back by some mountaineers. The Catholicus then confined him to his cell, and in a few days he died, as well as all the monks and bishops who were with him. And many various opinions were circulated as to the cause of his death.'

Such was the mode of dealing with a refractory Bishop in Syria during the thirteenth century. We are not exactly informed as to the amount of his insubordination, but the whole circumstances indicate rather a stringent code of ecclesiastical discipline. We apprehend that under a prelate of Mar Dencha's disposition, no Synod of Exeter would have been held.

This is, however, a mere episode in our history. We remark, that the labours of Abulfarage in executing the duties of his new dignity, were incessant. He was perpetually travelling—and there were then no railroads—from Mosul to Bagdad, or from Bagdad to Edessa; occasionally making his salaam to the Great Mogul, as he happened to cross his path, ordaining deacons and priests, and consecrating bishops, restoring decayed churches and building new ones, and, lastly, by way of variety, delivering a course of lectures on the Elements of Euclid, and the *Almagest* of Ptolemy! This amount of work is, as our American friends say, 'a pretty good stroke of business.' These labours and the poverty of his see would, we think, almost satisfy the clamours of those atrabilious Church reformers, Mr. Horsman and Sir Benjamin Hall. He appears also to have been a man of most disinterested spirit—we beg the pardon of Church reformers for supposing that a Christian Bishop can be disinterested!—and

he died, as one might expect, as poor as a Church mouse. He has placed on record a reply which he made when suspected of desiring the dignity of Patriarch. His language is so characteristic and so eloquent, that we will quote this apologetic passage. It appears that on the death of Mar Ignatius, A.D. 1282, some intrigues took place which Abulfarage wholly discouraged; and as some ecclesiastical ordinances had been broken, he would not receive the deputation sent to him by the guilty parties, on which a report appears to have been spread that he was displeased at not being appointed Patriarch himself. These suspicions gave rise to the following passage, in a letter addressed by Abulfarage to Philoxenus:—

‘Think not that I have the slightest desire to be made Patriarch, and that for this reason I have refused [to receive these deputations]. For He who searches the heart, knows that in me not a single member exists which desires this dignity, and I can assign many reasons for this repugnance. First, that almost forty years have elapsed since I received the grade of the episcopate, twenty years of which have been passed in the East, and twenty in the West. And I am satiated with this dignity. Wherefore I desire peace and quiet, and a tranquil life, and the end and the consummation promised to men of peace! And secondly, that in this my Eastern episcopate there has been by the mercy of God great tranquillity, and nothing has been wanting in it to me, that I should fly from it, as my predecessors have done! Even though our times have been disturbed, the extreme quiet which has marked my episcopate has been conceded to no other. And thirdly, even suppose that I had any desire, like other men, for the Patriarchate, now that the Presidency of the West has so long been desolated, how could any such desire remain under its present circumstances? Would it be a desire for Antioch? that would be sorrow and weeping for me! Would it be the priestly care of Guma, where not an inhabitant remains? or of Bercea? or of Mabug? or of Calonicus? or Edessa and Haran? which are all deserted, or the seven dioceses round Melitene, where not an inhabitant remains? Lacabene forsooth! and Archa, Kalisma, Semcha, Claudia, and Gargara! From these circumstances it is clear that my remonstrance proceeds from your reprehensible conduct, and not from my ambition. I have only remonstrated because you have acted in this matter without the consent of the East and the West.’

There is a touching dignity and earnestness about this language which go to the heart, and the graphic description which it includes of the condition of the East at that season is not without its value and interest. The miserable picture of desolation which this extract discloses must strike the mind of every reader; and it is a very remarkable fact, that in those regions where speculative errors about the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity have most prevailed, there the course of events has led to the extinction of the Christian faith, and the substitution of Islam!

The remaining portions of this autobiography are full of

interest; but as our chief object is to call attention to some passages from the Chronicle of Abulfarage, we cannot enlarge much upon the details of the author's life. It appears that the Tatar monarchs occasionally numbered a Christian lady, or at least a convert to Christianity, among their wives. Thus Dachuskotan is called the faithful or the believing wife of Hulaku. We read also of the faithful Queen Binacatona, in A.D. 1284, who assisted the Mafrian in the adornment of a church which he built in the fortress of Bartela! She sent for two painters from Constantinople to adorn it—'stupendous artists,' as Abulfarage informs us. A little incident which occurred is worth narrating in the present day, which does not differ, in some important matters, from the times of Abulfarage. It appears that the church in question, being built in honour of a celebrated saint, viz. St. John Barnagore, it was deemed advisable to enshrine his reliques there. But the priests and monks who were sent to disinter them, were unable to find them; and they learned from a dream, that unless the Mafrian should come himself, the reliques would not be found. To this the Mafrian gave a decided negative, as he gave no credence to the story of the dream; but his convictions were destined to be shaken. 'He fasted and prayed in entire solitude from Friday night to Sunday night, the 23 Tisri, and after the prayer of that night he saw a bright boy, who said to him, "The reliques are under the ancient Thronos,"' &c. It is unnecessary to pursue this narrative, which ends, as all such narratives, whether Græco-schismatical or Roman Catholic, invariably end, by the finding of the reliques in the very spot thus preternaturally indicated. This is quite natural, and it may be as natural, but it certainly is not a little amusing, to find that Assemanni, 'the slave of the Vatican,' as Gibbon somewhere designates him, quietly tells us that the reliques were no doubt previously deposited there, for the purpose of palming off a spurious miracle on the faithful!

About the age of sixty, in the midst of all his honourable and useful labours of love, the hand of death arrested his career, and the closing scene of his life is very graphically placed before us by his brother's pen. After finishing the Arabic translation of his Chronicle within three or four pages, he was seized with fever at Maraga. The physicians prescribed for him, and urgently entreated him to take the medicines they had ordered; but he

'refused, for he said that his time was now come, and medicine would be of no avail. Although he was strong as a lion, and his body was in that year stronger and more agreeable in temperament than ever, yet in three days he was so weakened by the fever, that when he asked for writing

materials in order to make some final arrangements relative to his cell and his disciples, he was unable to make use of them. Still he asked for them every two or three hours, and rubbed his right hand against his left, and said, "My strength is departed, and has failed!" "Thou hast deluded me, and hast denied me the destiny to die and be buried by the bishops, the monks, the priests, and the deacons, over whom I have presided twenty-two years! Thou hast withdrawn me from death, but this withdrawal has not availed me. Now, therefore, be strengthened and take courage! Weep not nor mourn as if some new thing had happened." These and similar words of consolation he addressed to those around him in cheerfulness all day. And at the same time he called to Said, the deacon and physician, saying, "Write what I am about to utter!" And this was the beginning of his words, "The son of man, like grass are his days, and like the flower of the field he buds!" Then after making some arrangements about vestments, he gave his disciples this command, "Remain in love, and separate not from one another, for when you are assembled in love I shall be among you!" His attendants tore their garments, and threw dust upon their heads, until nine o'clock at night; but he ceased not to speak to them in a cheerful and encouraging tone, till at last, in the midst of this exhibition of Christian calmness and cheerfulness, "he was extinguished as a lamp, glorious and shining, and a great pillar of the weak and infirm people of the Jacobites!" He departed thus to his Lord on Tuesday, 30th Tammuz, in the year 1597, *i.e.* A.D. 1285.¹

Thus died Abulfarage, or Gregory Bar-Hebræus, the chief ornament of Syriac literature; a man of vast attainments for the period in which he flourished, a zealous, earnest Christian bishop, an ornament and blessing to his country and his age.

One more personal anecdote is worth recording, to show the sway which judicial astrology then exercised over the minds of the greatest men, especially in the East. The very last page of Abulfarage's own *Memoirs*—the very thread which is taken up and continued by his brother—is occupied with a prediction of his own death, in the following remarkable terms:—

'In the year 1597 of the Greeks, which was the sixtieth year of the age of the Mafrian, he presaged his death, for he said, "In the year in which Saturn and Jove were in conjunction in Aquarius I was born; and after twenty years, when they were again in conjunction in Libra, I was consecrated bishop, and after twenty years, when they were in conjunction in Gemini, the office of Mafrian was intrusted to me; and after twenty years, when they are again in conjunction in Aquarius, I think I shall depart out of the world:" for he said, "Oh net of ages! in the year 1537 thy net caught me, and I think in the year 1597 I shall be no longer in thee!"'

The ink with which these words were written could scarcely be dry, when he was seized with this fatal disease, the progress and

¹ This is translated literally from the Syriac, but there is some difficulty about the date. It appears from Sir H. Nicolas (*Chronology of History*), that the 30th July in A.D. 1285 fell on a Monday. In A.D. 1286 the same day of the month fell on a Tuesday. Bernstein (*Ankündigung*, &c. p. 17) places the death of Abulfarage in A.D. 1286; and we are inclined to believe, from other reasons, that this is correct.

result of, which is so simply and touchingly told by Barsuma, his brother.

While we praise so highly this author, we are not blind to the importance of the great doctrines on which his views were heterodox. But we feel that great allowances are to be made for him, in consequence of the age in which he lived, and the circumstances of the Church in his day. And we believe, also, that the divergence of this class of sectarians from the true faith has been exaggerated by the use of indefinite language. It is necessary to make this statement in commenting on the life of Abulfarage; but having once called attention to the circumstance, we shall advert to it no more.

We do not feel disposed to give a list of this author's works, as they are very numerous, and the mere recital of their titles would give no adequate notion of their contents. For instance, one of his treatises is entitled 'The Business of Businesses, viz. Physics and Theology;' and another, 'The Book of the Apple of the Eye, Logic.' But the one great work which has achieved for him a more than European reputation, is the celebrated *Syriac Chronicle* to which we have already alluded. Those who have lifted the ponderous volume in which the works of Abulfarage are contained, now in the Bodleian Library, will have some notion of the extent, if not of the variety, of his lucubrations. The amiable librarian of that splendid storehouse of literary treasures, in entrusting us with the volume for the purpose of reference, intimated that, valuable as it was, he had less misgivings in leaving that volume in the hand of a stranger than almost any other, for it was quite clear that no person but a descendant of Hercules could run away with it.

Having thus traced the life of the author, we now direct the attention of our readers to his principal work, which Dr. Bernstein, as will be seen from the announcement at the head of this article, a few years ago proposed to re-edit. That intention, however, as we have said, he soon abandoned in favour of Dr. Tullberg, who had undertaken to assist him in editing the ecclesiastical portion of the *Chronicle*. Dr. Tullberg was in England shortly after Bernstein had given his collections for the other portion into his hands, and he was in connexion with some Oriental scholars at Oxford. But for some time we regret to state that we have been able to gain no tidings of the progress of this new edition. The specimen itself, though it only extends to three pages, is so beautiful in its typography, and so rich in historical illustration, that we feel extremely tantalized by the prospect of so admirable an edition, and sadly vexed by the fear that our hopes of seeing it executed may, after all, be destined to be disappointed. It is to be regretted that Bernstein himself should have given up

the plan. He is admirably qualified for the task. He is not only the best Syriac scholar of the day, but he has bestowed great attention on this author; and he has shown his great knowledge of the language, and his skill as an editor, in his new edition of Kirsch's *Chrestomathy*. He has added considerably to the extracts in that volume; his preface is admirable, and the Lexicon is the best Syriac Lexicon as yet published. The fact is, that a really good Syriac Lexicon is a desideratum in our literature. That of Castell was admirable for the time in which it was written, but it is adapted to little more than the study of the Bible in Syriac. The edition of that Lexicon by Michaëlis is a great improvement on all preceding Lexicons, but it is wholly insufficient for the requirements of the present day, because it is only calculated for the Syriac Bible, and the '*Bibliotheca Orientalis*' of Assemani. The means of improving this Lexicon are to be found in the Glossaries to the *Chrestomathies* which have appeared at various times in Germany. The *Chrestomathy* of Michaëlis was, we believe, the earliest of these useful publications; but the Glossary which was to accompany it was not published by Michaëlis himself; in fact, it did not see the light till 1829, when a very able Syriac scholar, Doëpke, finding that most of the copies of the *Chrestomathy* remained unsold, composed an admirable Glossary for it, and added some very valuable critical notes upon the text of the Syriac extracts. The next *Chrestomathy* which was published was that of Kirsch, in 1789; and this has served as a foundation to almost all succeeding works of the same kind, for the compilers have generally contented themselves with repeating the same extracts which Kirsch made with great judgment from the *Chronicle* of Abulfarage, and accompanying them by a few passages drawn from other sources. These remarks apply to the *Chrestomathies* of Oberleitner, Rödiger, &c.; but those of Michaëlis, Tychsen, Seyffarth, and Hahn, form an exception to this general rule. Seyffarth and Hahn conjointly published a very valuable selection from the Hymns of Ephrem Syrus, and accompanied the hymns with good notes, and an excellent Glossary. But by far the best Syriac Lexicon which has yet been published, is that appended by Bernstein to his new edition of Kirsch, in three octavo volumes, two of which are devoted to the Glossary.¹ From a careful comparison of

¹ Cardinal Wiseman has alluded to the defects of Syriac Lexica in the Preface to his '*Horre Syriace*.' We should be glad to know what the learned Cardinal meant by one sentence in that portion of the Preface. After stating that he is only exhibiting a specimen of the deficiencies of existing Lexica, and after declaring he is well aware how much labour a new Lexicon would require, he proceeds thus:—'*Accedit præterea Castellani operis præstantia, quod quidem emendaturum, vix sperare potes, nisi integrum incudi reddere audeas; at quot libras in uno viro*

these Glossaries, and a search through the later publications of Mr. Cureton, a very admirable Syriac Lexicon might be formed; but the labour would be great, and the reward—*nil!*

We now proceed to give some extracts from the great work of Abulfarage—his Syriac Chronicle. We have before stated that it consists of three parts—

1. The Dynasties—a Civil Chronicle from Adam to A.D. 1286.

2. An Ecclesiastical History, which falls into two divisions.

(1.) A Catalogue and Chronicle of the Patriarchs of Antioch, called by this author the Pontiffs of the West.

(2.) A Catalogue and Chronicle of the Primates, Patriarchs, and Mafrians of the East.

The two latter divisions have never yet seen the light, and are known only by the extracts from them printed in Assemani, B. O. The portion of Ecclesiastical History to which they refer is very obscure; and if Dr. Tullberg perseveres in his plan of publishing this work, much light may probably be thrown on many difficult points. Indeed, it is so obscure, that Renaudot, a man of considerable learning, pronounced it incapable of being illustrated by native writers. But our business lies with the Civil Chronicle; and the '*Historia Dynastiarum*,' so far from exhausting the interest which attaches to this part of the work, only enhances it. The savoury pieces of information which Abulfarage reserves for his Christian auditory, are precisely those which prove most interesting to European readers, and to them we now invite especial attention.

The most remarkable of the portions omitted in the Arabic are the pranks of the Khalif Hakem—the founder of the Druses—and the account given of Richard Cœur de Lion and Saladin. One of the most interesting parts of the narrative common to both, is the history given of the Tatar and Mogul empire.

Hakem—the celebrated founder of the Druses—like many respectable potentates of the East, rejoiced in a variety of epithets, enough to make a compositor's hair stand on end, from sheer dread of ever placing them in type in a readable form. His full title as given by Sylvestre de Sacy is, Hakem Beamrillah Abou Ali Mansour. The strange proceedings of this Khalif of Egypt were not, we believe, till very lately at all worthily com-

requirit hujusmodi ceptum Augcanum Herculis laborem vincens!' Did the learned Professor of Oriental languages (as the Cardinal then was) just dash off this sentence in allusion to Juvenal's

'Expende Annibalem, quot libras in duce summo
Invenies!'

without the remotest notion of its meaning? If he did, it would not be altogether unlike some of his later literary exploits.

memorated in English. We do not remember meeting with any account of this remarkable man which gives any notion of the events of his life, till we saw some time ago a very entertaining little volume lately published, entitled the 'Modern Syrians.' A very meagre account of Hakem is indeed to be found in the only work of Volney of which one can speak in terms of commendation—his 'Travels in Syria.' He was a shrewd observer; and his picture of Palestine, intended to bring discredit on Holy Writ, only serves to confirm some of its most striking predictions: and that too, by the most valuable of all testimony, the evidence of a hostile witness. His lucubrations on Ancient History are contemptible; but he introduces occasionally into his Travels a tolerable summary of interesting portions of Oriental History, derived from Arabic writers. Among these is his 'History of the Druses, with a slight Biographical Sketch of Hakem.' The latter is, however, so brief as hardly to form an exception to the general silence of English literature as to Hakem. The Druses are so interesting to Oriental students, that Sylvestre de Sacy—the greatest French authority in regard to the Semitic languages—did not consider his time misemployed when devoted to an elaborate publication designed to illustrate their origin and history, of which the Life of Hakem forms one of the most considerable portions. His chief authorities are the Arabic writers, especially Macrizi, El-Makin, &c.; but, it must be remembered, that Abulfarage lived at least a century nearer to the period in which Hakem flourished, than Macrizi, the primary Arabic source of information.

The Fatimite Khalifs having transferred the seat of sovereignty to Cairo, the third Prince of that dynasty was Hakem. He is described by Gibbon as a 'frantic youth,' and Volney calls him 'one of the most extraordinary princes of whom history has preserved the memory.' Volney adds, 'He compelled the Jews and Christians to abjure their religion, and then permitted them to resume it. He prohibited the making slippers for women, to prevent them from coming out of their houses. He burnt one-half of Cairo for his diversion, while his soldiers pillaged the other. Not contented with these extravagant actions, he forbade the pilgrimage to Mecca, fasting, and the five prayers; and at length carried his madness so far, as to desire to pass for God himself.' This outline of his conduct is rather amply illustrated by the Syriac Chronicle of Abulfarage, and we now proceed to give a few extracts, which, we believe, have never before appeared in our own language. We have translated them directly from the Syriac; or, rather, have slightly altered them from a literal translation which we made some years ago.

His reign began in the year of the Hejira 386, or A.D. 996;

and his frolics began very soon after his accession to power. One of his first amusements was, a persecution of the Christians and Jews, in a fit of indignation against the former for the imposture of the miraculous fire at Easter. The account of Abulfarage is circumstantial and curious. It is as follows:—

‘At that season Hakem issued his commands, and the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem was utterly destroyed, and its furniture entirely despoiled. A thousand churches in his dominions were destroyed at the same time. He ordered proclamations to be made that honours should be bestowed on every Christian who would embrace Islam, while those who refused should be subjected to insult, and bear a cross upon their necks; while the Jews who refused should also carry on their necks the likeness of the head of a calf, in remembrance of that which they worshipped in the wilderness. They were forbidden to wear rings on the right hand, or ride on horseback or on mules, and only permitted to ride on asses with humble saddles and wooden stirrups. All who refused to submit to these indignities, were ordered to gather together their goods and depart into some place under the dominion of the Franks. On the promulgation of this decree, many by night abjured Christianity; while others, who submitted to wear the cross, made that of gold and ornamented their saddles with mahogany. When this came to Hakem’s ears, he ordained that the cross should be of wood and four pounds in weight, ordering that those who infringed this regulation should suffer death; while he commanded the Jews to carry round their necks a wooden bell¹ of six pounds weight, and that whenever they went to the bath they should bind smaller metal bells upon their necks to separate them from the Mohammedans. This persecution took its origin from the hatred of a certain man towards the Christians, he having reported to Hakem that the Christians, when they assemble to celebrate the Passover in the Temple in Jerusalem,² deceive the Prefect of the Church. They anoint, according to his account, with oil of balsamon the iron chain by which the lamp is suspended over the Sepulchre; and when the Moslem Governor seals the door of the Sepulchre, they, from the roof, set fire to the top of the iron chain, and the light runs down to the lamp and ignites it; but the Christians begin to sing *Képie déhson*, and weep until they see the light that descends from heaven on the Sepulchre, by which they are confirmed in their faith. This persecution continued till within a short time of Hakem’s death, when he repented of what he had done, and gave commandment that those who had abjured their faith should return to its profession, and he entreated the Christians to rebuild their churches, and those who had fled he requested to return again to their houses.’

There is much which is curious in this extract, but the most remarkable part of it is evidently the account given of the Easter fire. We have here the view taken of this imposture by a Mohammedan in the eleventh century, reported by a Christian Bishop of the twelfth. One can hardly fail to call to mind, and

¹ The best Syriac authorities are rather at fault in the explanation of this passage—the literal translation of which would be ‘a stump in the likeness of the hand of a bell.’ But what is exactly intended by ‘the hand of a bell,’ they do not know; perhaps some author, as yet unedited, may use the word ‘hand’ in a passage which would give a clue to its meaning here.

² i. e. to celebrate Easter in the Church of the Resurrection.

apply to this disgraceful trick of the ecclesiastical Greeks of the present day, the remark which Mons. Roque, at Athens, used to make in comparing the Athenians of the present day with their classical ancestors: 'Monsieur, ils sont la même canaille qu'ils étaient au temps de Themistocles.' The trick is performed, however, in the present day, with rather more attempt at concealment in the machinery. But this passage, at all events, is a contribution towards the history of this imposture, and is the more curious because it is one of the portions of the Syriac Chronicle omitted in the Arabic abridgement.

Our next extract will also be derived from the same part of Abulfarage, being a description of rather an exciting scene in Bagdad. To those of our readers who can remember a Gown and Town row in Cambridge, the account will suggest some reflections on the identity of man's nature in all ages and localities. Where there is a body of men separated from the ordinary population of a place, either by privileges, profession, or faith, there is a mass of inflammable matter which it requires only a small spark to ignite. We need look no further for an illustration, than to the accounts of the insurrection of the Mohammedans of Bombay, which occurred a few years ago. We proceed now to give a brief account of a

'STREET RIOT IN BAGDAD.

'In the 403d year of the Mohammedans (A.D. 1011), died the wife of Abunatzar, the son of Israel, the Christian lawyer in Bagdad. They raised her on a bier in the day time with a cross and lights, while old men and monks, and female mourners weeping, preceded her with cymbals. A Mohammedan being incensed at this, threw a stone at the bier, and the servants of an eminent Emir, who surrounded the bier as guards, smote the Mohammedan with the sword, and there was an awful riot in Bagdad, and many of the Christians and Mohammedans were killed, while Abunatzar, the husband of the deceased lady, fled to the house of a great man; nor was the tumult appeased till he had been taken and dragged to the palace of the Caliph. He was imprisoned a short time, and then released, to the great joy of the Christians.'—*Abulf.* p. 216.

Although recorded in the midst of the memoirs of Hakem, this incident, occurring at Bagdad, had of course nothing to do with the eccentricities of that Khalif. But his vagaries are so strange, that one hardly knows which to select as the most characteristic. It seems that he had a very bad opinion of the ladies of Cairo, and employed a body of female spies to make him acquainted with all their intrigues. This system of espionage led him occasionally to send his guards with some of the eunuchs of the palace to call at certain houses, to order the immediate appearance of certain ladies, whose names had been reported to him as guilty of grave indiscretion. No matter what their rank

might be, they must appear at this formidable summons. When a sufficient number of these unhappy victims had been collected, five perchance, or ten—for the Khalif was, as the Irish say, 'none of your dirty, exact kind of people'—they were quietly sunk in the Nile! Not content with this reign of terror, the ladies were strictly confined to the house, and their most natural amusement, shopping, abominably curtailed. The dealers who went from house to house with tapes and bobbins, and other implements of female industry, were ordered to play bo-peep at the doors of females; the ladies were to open the doors, but to take care that neither their hands nor their faces could be seen! The articles they wanted were to be thrust into the doors on a kind of spoon, with a long handle, which was also to serve for the export of the price, as well as for the import of the store. But even this indulgence was only obtained after representations of the serious evils which the strict blockade of the doors had actually entailed on widows and single ladies, who had neither husband nor brother to send out to do their shopping for them. It is represented as having nearly caused the starvation of several of the ladies of Cairo. After this narrative, we can hardly wonder at the practical joke played upon Hakem, by placing a female figure made of pasteboard in the line of his evening rounds. When he ordered his guards to despatch the contumacious woman, as he was expected to do, they discovered the imposture, and found a trimming libel in the hand of the figure, which incensed Hakem beyond measure. The libellous document contained charges of licentiousness against his maiden sister, and Hakem immediately determined that he would take signal vengeance on the people of Cairo for this impertinence. He ordered therefore his guards to slay every Egyptian whom they met, to plunder the houses, and set fire to the streets; in short, to make an onslaught upon the city, to which we have scarcely any parallel, unless some of the scenes in the various Revolutions of modern France may be considered worthy to stand by its side.

The circumstances of Hakem's death are involved in considerable mystery. Sylvestre de Sacy does not appear to give full credence to the narrative of Abulfarage, because he has adopted a different version of the affair. But we cannot fail to repeat that Abulfarage is a more ancient authority by a century than the most eminent Arabic writers, to whom De Sacy gives greater weight.¹ We shall therefore state very fully the view

¹ De Sacy refers so slightly to the *Syriac Chronicle* at all, that if one did not find it quoted among his authorities, and a positive assurance given that he had actually made a translation of every one of those authorities before he began his task, one would think that he had overlooked it, or contented himself with

taken in the Chronicle. In consequence of the scandalous reports contained in the libel found in the hand of the pasteboard figure, Hakem was about to order some very unpleasant investigations respecting his sister's conduct. She was entirely disinclined to submit to any such indignities, and determined to sacrifice the life of her brother. She applied in consequence to a nobleman who was under suspicion in the eyes of Hakem; she promised him her hand, and a share in the regency, which would naturally fall into her hands during the minority of her nephew, then a child. Hakem was a strict believer in judicial astrology, and the story proceeds thus:—

‘ Hakem’s sister having overcome the scruples of this nobleman, he said to her, “Instruct me now in the mode by which we may effect our purpose.” “My brother,” she replied, “constantly visits alone the summit of a hill by night, to contemplate the stars; and in his horoscope (nativity, literally) it is written, that on a certain night he is in great danger of death; but if the danger of that hour shall pass away, he will live for eighty years longer! Therefore prepare two of your servants—clever and confidential—to waylay him in one of the caverns of the hill, to rush out upon him and kill him.” And when that night came, Hakem rode upon his mule up the hill, not suffering any one to remain with him on the top of the hill except a little boy, and leaving the rest of his servants below the hill. Hakem then began to look towards the East; and when he saw Mars rising over the horizon, he muttered between his lips, and said, “Thou hast ascended, thou cursed one! thou shedder of blood! The hour is come.” As he uttered these words the two accomplices sprung upon him, drew a rope round his neck, and strangled him; they slew the boy with the sword, and hamstringed the mule. The body of Hakem they carried down by the other side of the mountain, and took it to his sister, who hid it in the house without being perceived, nor was any one conscious of what took place except herself, the two murderers, and their master.’

Such is the account given of Hakem’s death by Abulfarage; and he adds that his sister immediately accused the murderers, and procured their execution, so that she herself might take the administration of the government into her own hands, without fearing the detection of her crime. Abulfarage then mentions some reports concerning his latter days, which had obtained a partial belief: first, that he had retired to the desert of Asceto, and died as a monk; and secondly, that while Hakem was persecuting the Christians, our Lord appeared to him as he had done to St. Paul, and from that time he became a believer, and retired to the Desert, where he died. He states also, but very briefly, Hakem’s profane assumption of the Divine attributes. He remarks:—

‘It is said that he almost equalled the profaneness of Pharaoh by saying, *Mine is the Nile, and I made it.* (Ezekiel xxix. 3.) And when flatterers came

the Arabic abridgement. We should be very glad to meet with his translation of this portion of the Chronicle, but we do not know in whose hands his papers were left.

and addressed to him language such as this, *Peace to thee, the solitary and the only one, or Peace to thee, who killest and makest alive, who makest rich and makest poor*, he was delighted with the flattery. In consequence of this, one of those flatterers, going up to Mecca and entering the mosque, struck the black stone with a spear, and broke it, exclaiming, *Wherefore do ye worship and kiss, ye foolish ones! that which can neither profit nor injure you, and desert him, who killeth and maketh alive in Egypt?*

These are the simple notices afforded of this remarkable character in the Syriac Chronicle; but it will be observed that this assumption of Divine attributes is very hesitatingly assigned to Hakem by Abulfarage, nor does he hint that he thus became in any way the leader of a sect.

Whatever judgment may eventually be passed on the authority of this narrative, it appears clearly desirable that, in an historical question of so much interest as the origin of the Druses, the earliest account of their supposed founder should be duly weighed. We do not claim for it any pre-eminent authority, but its actual value has never yet been sufficiently ascertained.

We should call attention to another portion of the Syriac Chronicle, were it not that it has been published with a translation into English in the little volume entitled 'Syriac Reading Lessons,' which has issued within the last few years from the press of the Messrs. Bagster:—we mean, the history of Saladin and Richard Cœur de Lion, of which scarcely a word is found in the 'Historia Dynastiarum,' but which is treated at such length in the Syriac that it occupies about ten pages. The circumstances of the Crusade in which Richard I. and Philip of France fought under the same banners—an occurrence to which no parallel has since occurred—are narrated in these pages, but more with reference to the sort of intercourse which took place between Saladin and Richard, than to the general history of the times. Indeed, Abulfarage was so far misinformed in regard to European affairs, that he tells us, 'it was said that Richard died before he reached England.' But there is one passage which it may be worth while to quote, because it relates to a dark transaction, which has sometimes been used to blacken the memory of the great English warrior. Even Gibbon, who professes, in his text, to disbelieve the slander, insinuates a doubt in his note, by stating that the Moslems believed it, and by disputing what he is pleased to call the King's only defence. This transaction was the murder of the Marquis of Montserrat, by two emissaries of 'The Old Man of the Mountain.' They confessed *under torture*, that they were instigated by Richard, and the Moslems greedily accepted the calumny. Bohaeddin is cited as the authority for this slanderous accusation, but we may quote with more confidence the account of a Christian Bishop who lived within a short time of the events. He narrates the transaction

in the following words, which we shall translate with the most scrupulous exactness, preferring in this instance accuracy to elegance.

‘And when the year 588 of the Mohammedans had arrived, the Franks went to Askelon, and they began to repair its buildings. And the Marquis, the Governor of Tyre, because a disagreement had arisen between him and the King of England on this account—viz., that it is not right that he should govern Tyre, and he (the King) wished to take Tyre from him—promised therefore to Saladin that he would be with the Mohammedans. And when a message such as this had been sent to Saladin, two men attacked the Marquis as he was riding—two Ishmaelites in the dress of monks; and when one of them had smitten him with a knife, his companion fled to the church, which was in the neighbourhood. And the Marquis having been wounded, they brought him to that church. And when the Ishmaelite monk, the companion of him who smote him, saw that he was yet speaking, it happened that he also rushed upon him in the church, and smote him a second time; and he died at once. And those two Ishmaelites, when the Franks had taken them and tortured them, said that the King of England had sent them. *And on account of the hatred that existed between them, the Franks believed the words of those two murderers.* And it was afterwards discovered that *Sinan, the chief of the Ishmaelites, had sent them.* And the King of England gave Tyre to Count Henry, and he married the wife of the Marquis and had intercourse with her, although she was *enceinte*; a deed repugnant to the law.’

Such is the evidence as detailed by Abulfarage. The calumny is based only on the word, of a murderer, tortured by the enemies of the person whom the slander maligns. We know that torture will extract almost any confession, and the accusations which rest upon that basis are utterly valueless; but Abulfarage speaks of the attribution of the deed to Sinan as an established fact, and it seems fairly entitled to that name.

We have seen in the case of Hakem the extreme importance and interest of the information derived from our author, but that interest arises chiefly from the character of the individual. The portion of his writings to which we invite attention is remarkable, not only in regard to the individuals whose history is narrated, but for the extensive influence which their government exercised on European and general politics—we mean the Tatar Princes. The amount of that influence is greater than was suspected even a few years ago; fresh discoveries are made at every new search into the archives of England and France—the two countries of all others the least likely to be affected by Tatar movements.

Yet so it is! The researches of Abel Remusat in Paris,¹ and of Hudson Turner² in London, have indicated a degree of intercourse between these kingdoms and the Tatar emperors of which the best informed writers till very lately had scarcely any notion. M. Remusat observes that, 'The Great Mogul Empire, destined to embrace the whole world, was created in less time than it ordinarily takes to found and people a city.' He then proceeds to extract from the unpublished treasures of the Parisian Library, as well as from all the stores of works, published long ago, the notices which illustrate the intercourse between these Moguls and the sovereigns of Europe. Of these some are direct negotiations between the Tatar princes and the States of Europe; others are communications between the European sovereigns, which demonstrate the dread which the very name of Tatar inspired in the thirteenth century. The first occasion on which the Christian powers were confronted with the Tatar hordes, was during the irruption made into Georgia by the generals of Tuli, the son of Jenghis Khan, about the year 1221. The Mohammedan powers had made but a slight impression in Georgia under the Khalifs; the Seljuks exercised a more powerful, but a transient influence. David the Restorer had retaken Teflis, and driven the Moslems beyond the Araxes. The Tatar hordes, however, now began to overrun the eastern portion of Europe. They took Moscow, and drove the King of Hungary before them. The dread of them now began to reach France, Germany, and England. Queen Blanche said to S. Louis, as we learn from Ivo Narbonensis, 'What shall we do in these sad circumstances?' 'My mother,' replied the saintly monarch, 'let us be sustained by a heavenly consolation, because if these fellows whom we call Tartars should come, we will drive them back to Tartarus, from whence they came.' The Emperor Frederick wrote to Edward I. of England, in the same strain, calling them *Tartarei*, and indicating the appropriateness of the epithet from the fire and smoke of their advancing armies.³ As the name *Tatars* is an Oriental designation, we

¹ See his 'Mémoires sur les Relations Politiques des Princes Chrétiens, et particulièrement des Rois de France avec les Empereurs Mongols: par M. Abel Remusat.' Paris, 1822. 4to.

² We allude to a paper on 'Some Unpublished Notices of the Time of Edward I.' printed in the *Archæological Journal*, No. 29, March 1851. We deeply regret the loss of this very able archæologist and valuable writer. His 'Notices of the Domestic Architecture of England previous to the Time of Richard II.' is a most valuable contribution to the architectural literature of the country.

³ This European dread of the Tatars, and the absurdity of deducing their name from *Tartarus*, are both treated of by Gibbon with his usual sagacity and learning, in the able summary of early Tatar history, given in his sixty-fourth chapter. The references in that chapter indicate all the authorities available at the time in which Gibbon wrote.

cannot compliment either S. Louis or the Emperor on the accuracy of their etymology, although we can enter into the feelings under which they penned these dire forebodings. Matthew of Paris is very full on the subject of these mediæval hobgoblins, but we are not inclined now to quote largely from his pages. One little episode, related with much quaintness by M. Remusat, from the account given by some Dominican monks, who went on an embassy from Pope Innocent IV. to Batchou-nogan, in the year 1245, we must briefly indicate. We recommend it as a model for modern diplomacy.

When the Dominicans had an audience of Batchou, Ascelin their leader told him that they came from the Pope, the greatest of men. The Tatars, feeling their dignity rather insulted, asked the Dominicans whether they 'had never heard that the Khan was the Son of Heaven'—a designation which, according to M. Remusat, means nothing more than 'Emperor,' but which is commonly translated 'Son of God.' Ascelin, who was spokesman, assured them that the Pope knew nothing whatever of the Khan; and when he refused to prostrate himself, their indignation was almost uncontrollable; but it rose to a pitch of perfect fury when the Dominicans offered to salute him if he would become a Christian. The officers of the Court recommended Batchou, on this insult being offered, to flay the ambassadors alive, and to send their skins stuffed with straw to the Pope. One can almost picture the scene—the fury of the Tatars, and the terror of the white-robed monks. But the dramatic interest was now at its height, and the 'dignus vindice nodus' had been attained; for the eldest wife of Batchou released the Dominicans from their fearful position, and prevented the commission of an unparalleled outrage, by hinting at the possibility of reprisals, and by suggesting that the Khan himself had been scandalized on a former occasion, when the heart of an ambassador had been plucked out.

The early history of the Tatar monarchy is one in which we are not troubled by a superfluity of authentic and early narratives; and for this reason the latter portion of the *Syriac Chronicle* is particularly valuable. Page after page is filled with the history of that monarchy, from the time of its origin to the days of Hulaku, who was the contemporary of Abulfarage, and personally known to him. It is true that among the numberless monarchs of the multitudinous tribes into which the Tatar nation is divided, only a few have achieved an European reputation, and become known to the literature and history of the Western world. The rest—

Fortisque Gyas, fortisque Cloanthus—

although illustrious among their own people and in their own

land, are to the Western people pretty much what the aristocracy of Kräh-winkel, in the Deutschen Kleinstädter, might be to the Court of Vienna. The exceptions to that Cimmerian darkness owe their immunity from neglect, partly to their own intrinsic greatness, partly to their connexion with European politics and history. The Khalifat of Bagdad is known to us by so many illustrious names that some rays of its glory necessarily fall upon the power to which, six hundred years after its establishment by the influence of Mohammed, it succumbed. The Khalifat of Bagdad, beginning immediately after the decease of Mohammed, with Abu Bekr, existed about 626 years, during about 523 of which it was in one family, and was finally extinguished by Hulaku in A. D. 1258. This latter gentleman—who, like the rest of the Tatar sovereigns, rejoiced in the lofty title of ‘King of Kings,’ and, like them, also is remarkable for the ambiguity with which the spelling of his name is attended—figures of course in the Chronicle of Abulfarage with considerable effect; an effect which is greatly heightened by the circumstance that he was, as we have observed, a personal acquaintance of our author. This personage, whose career appears in the page of history marked only by burning towns and slaughtered people, whose grim visage seems to glare upon us through an atmosphere of smoke and blood, is presented to us in the Chronicle of Abulfarage in a very different light. No man is a hero to his *valet-de-chambre*; and it would seem that even the grim sovereigns of Tartary were not quite Blue-beards to the Christian Bishops with whom they were brought into an anomalous kind of relation. We have been long persuaded—contrary to the vulgar belief—of the great and inestimable advantage of a *bad* reputation, or rather of a bad reputation of a certain sort. Let a man only have the reputation of being a brute, and then, every time that he is approached under those softer influences which create the *mollia tempora fandi*, his reputation is spread, and his praises are sounded in a thousand different channels. In the same manner, all the personal intercourse of Abulfarage with Hulaku would lead to the belief that he, too, was not without a tender spot in his heart.

The Syriac Chronicle, indeed, supplies us with many most interesting particulars relative to the origin of the Tatar dominion, and especially with regard to the family of Jenghiz-Khan. In reading it, we must always bear in mind that it is the work of a writer who lived at no great distance of time from the events here described, and who was familiar with the localities in which they took place. We cannot indeed always congratulate him on his perspicuity in geographical details; and in his description of the original habitat of the Tatar tribes, he certainly cannot

be considered to excel in that very desirable quality. After a very indifferent description of their early abodes, he continues thus:—

‘ And before Jenghiz-Khan,¹ their first king, arose, they had no chief, but paid tribute to the king of the Chataians, or Chinese. They were clothed in the skins of dogs or wolves, and fed upon the flesh of mice and other abominable creatures, as well as animals which died a natural death; their drink was the milk of mares. The mark of honour of their chief ruler is an iron stirrup; those of others are made of wood. And in that year, *i.e.* the year 1514 of the Greeks (A.D. 1202), and the year 599 of the Mohammedans, when Yunuch-Khan, that is, *John the Christian King*,² was ruling over the tribe of the barbarian Huns which is called Krith, Jenghiz-Khan was constantly in his service. But his intelligence and activity excited the jealousy of his superior, who desired to seize him by stratagem, and put him to death. Two youths in the service of Yunuch-Khan having perceived the trap laid for him, made it known to Jenghiz. And Jenghiz immediately communicated it to his own people, and left their tents by night, and secretly formed an ambush. And in the morning, when Yunuch-Khan attacked his tents, he found them deserted. And then the followers of the house of Jenghiz attacked him; and near a fountain called Baalshinah they fought, and Jenghiz conquering, Yunuch was routed. Several engagements subsequently took place, until the whole force of Yunuch-Khan was entirely broken up, he himself killed, and his wife and children taken captive. And Jenghiz exalted the two lads, and bestowed their liberty upon them, with all the spoil which they might have taken, and the following privileges besides, *viz.* exemption for ever from the payment of the king's portion, permission to approach the king at all times without special command, and exemption from capital punishment. Jenghiz ennobled also the rest of his companions in that war, and specially honoured the tribes of the Mongolians, which is called Aviratheans, by ordaining that they should possess the privilege of intermarriage with the royal family. And this ordinance remains to the present day.’

We consider the latter sentence of some value in creating a degree of confidence and credit for the former part of this narrative, which, as a mere historical announcement, it could hardly have. The rise of the Tatar power under Jenghiz-Khan dates from the early part of the thirteenth century, and in the middle of that century Abulfarage was often brought into official communication and personal intercourse with the Tatar court. His information, therefore, on such subjects, may be presumed to be derived from credible sources. The person whom he calls Unuch, or Yunuch-Khan, in the Syriac Chronicle, is called Vang, or Ung-Khan, in the Arabic abridgement, and is the indi-

¹ On the orthography of this name we may refer to Gibbon, chap. lxiv. But the orthography of Oriental names, even of those connected with the Arabic language, is a very arbitrary affair at present. They are capable of being reduced to a system; and it is a pity that some attempt is not made to obtain uniformity in this respect. The Tatar names, and names derived from other languages, are, however, a more complicated business.

² *i.e.* Prester John. See below.

vidual of whom so many fabulous tales are related under the name of PRESTER JOHN, the great Khan, who was reported, chiefly by the Nestorian missionaries, to have embraced the Christian faith, although the amount of his Christianity appears merely to have extended to giving a limited toleration to Christians.

We must now, however, call special attention to the continuation of this extract in the Chronicle, which disappears in the Arabic abridgement, or rather undergoes a remarkable curtailment, in order to adapt the work to Mohammedan readers. Abulfarage proceeds to inform us that the victory of Jenghiz-Khan and this loss of life to Ung-Khan, or Prester John, ought to be traced to the just retribution of God on one who had renounced Christianity in his later years. The passage in Syriac proceeds thus :—

‘And it is proper to know that King John, the Christian, was not rejected inconsiderately, but after his heart had turned away from the fear of Christ his Lord, who had exalted him, and he had taken a wife from the Chinese people who are called Karacata. And when he deserted the worship of his forefathers, and changed to other gods, God took his kingdom from him, and gave it to one who was better than he, and whose heart was upright before God.’

Now, of this retributive act of Providence, as we may well imagine, the Arabic text preserves *ὅνδε γρῦ*—not a single syllable, but both the narratives immediately mention the prophetic announcement delivered by Tubut Tangare, who, during the season of cold and frost, ran naked through the mountains of Tatar, making a proclamation in the following words :—‘I went to God, and He said unto me, “I have given the whole earth to Timour-shin and to his children, and I have named him Jenghiz-Khan.”’

The Syriac Chronicle gives, as does also the Arabic, an account of the four sons of Jenghiz-Khan.

1. Tushi—devoted to hunting—whom he appointed Master of the Hounds.
2. Shagatai—whom he made chief of the lawyers—the Tatar Lord Chancellor.
3. Uchatai—to whom he committed the administration of the kingdom—the Prime Minister, and eventually his successor in the kingdom.
4. Tuli—whom he made Commander of the Forces.

Jenghiz-Khan thus composed his cabinet of his own family. We do not know whether we are indebted to the gentleman with the euphonious name of *Shagatai* for the laws which Abulfarage quotes in his Chronicle, but omits in his abridgement. They have one great merit—they are very brief; and we should appre-

hend no great nicety would have prevailed in the administration of chastisement to those who infringed them. But this reminds us of another very curious passage in the Chronicle, which informs us how ingeniously some Eastern nations contrive to avoid the employment of any functionary in that awful service which the High Sheriff of every county is obliged to perform, either *per se* or by deputy. We have heard of such treatises as 'Every Man his own Washerwoman,' but we never before heard of 'Every Man his own Executioner.' But they manage these things better in the East. Here is their method:—

‘A SINGULAR KIND OF PUNISHMENT.’

‘And Tergoman sent again an envoy to Aleppo, and seized upon Rashid-eddin, who had fled thither, and shut him up in a castle called Habig. Now, from that castle none of those imprisoned in it were ever suffered to escape alive, except this man, who afterwards obtained favour, and was liberated. In the work of this castle there is a door, at a very great height, and outside of it a small ledge, on which a man could scarcely stand, much less sit. And when any one of high rank is capitally convicted, on whom they are unwilling to lay hands and kill him, they take him out and set him upon this ledge. They then shut the door, and after he has stood there a day or two, he is overcome with sleep, falls down, and is dashed to pieces.’

This passage would surely excite the envy of that active functionary of the English law to whom we have just alluded. This Oriental contrivance would render his task comparatively easy, and render his employment a much nearer approximation to a dignified service. Count de Maistre, in his ‘*Soirées de St. Petersbourg*,’ has endeavoured to ennoble this employment; but notwithstanding the cleverness of that remarkable writer, the great apostle of Ultramontanism and the tool of the Jesuits, the defence breaks down.

We might continue our extracts from the Tatar history of Abulfarage almost *ad libitum*, but this essay has extended to so great length, that we feel it necessary to refrain. We will, therefore, only state generally that the Chronicle enters into the history of Munga-Khan and Gujuk-Khan very particularly, but is still more elaborate in its account of the taking of Bagdad by Hulaku (commonly called by Gibbon and other English writers Holagou), and of the other warlike exploits of that great Tatar conqueror. These portions of the history deserve translation and illustration. As we have already stated the demerits of Bruns and his edition, we cannot part with Abulfarage without repeating that we must receive Bruns's gift with gratitude; but could he have given more time to both the processes which engaged his attention, the result would have been more satisfactory. He was an able Syriac scholar; but his mistranslations, from his

haste, are sometimes so ludicrous that it casts much suspicion on the rest. For instance, in one passage where Abulfarage, who seems to have kept as sharp a look-out as the editor of a country newspaper for every *lusus naturæ*, whether in the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdom, is stating the fact that 'in Further India a she-mule had given birth to a foal, which many persons 'had seen,' Bruns translates the passage, and makes it an announcement 'that a beautiful figure had been delivered, and many persons had seen its embryo!' Lorsbach (in his 'Archiv für die Morgenländische Literatur,' p. 199), in a very admirable review of the Chronicle, makes himself extremely merry with this blunder. But although these errors show that no mere reader of the translation can ever rely on the information he derives from the work, they must be looked upon with some degree of leniency, when we consider the difficulties under which this task was achieved. Still, the incompetent manner in which the work was edited, and the entire, or almost entire, want of illustrative notes, have much enhanced the desire for a new edition; and the Prospectus of Bernstein, or rather the specimen with which it is accompanied, has shown how much may be accomplished by a competent scholar and diligent editor. We may remark also, that the portion selected as a specimen is the most unpromising part of all—the mere commencement of the book, which is occupied with the Antediluvian history. Abulfarage, like Josephus, must certainly have stumbled upon some private memoranda, made by Adam and the rest of the Patriarchs, or they could never have given us so much information in regard to their personal history! But be this as it may, almost every three or four lines furnishes occasion to Herr Bernstein to pour from his large stock of knowledge some fertilizing drops. We must repeat the regret we have already expressed at his abandonment of this undertaking, although Dr. Tullberg, should he carry it on, would, no doubt, give us much valuable information. We believe no living writer to be so familiar with the language and the author as Bernstein; and for this reason we feel that no one can do as much for Abulfarage as he could. But we should gladly hail an edition from any person qualified for the task, as Dr. Tullberg is, and who would avail himself of the labours of Lorsbach, of Doëpke, of Mayer, and of the numerous other critics whose lucubrations are scattered over the various periodicals and pamphlets of Germany. With the collections of Bernstein added to his own, we cannot doubt that an admirable edition would be the result.

And here we take our leave of this deeply interesting author. In the extracts which we have given, we cannot point out to the admiration of our readers the graces of style or the beauties of composition. The lively form of Annals unhappily deprives the

work of such ornaments;¹ but we appeal to it as a valuable storehouse of solid information on a subject of which even well-educated Englishmen are often profoundly ignorant. We look upon it also as a very remarkable production for the age and country in which it appeared; and, therefore, whether it be regarded as illustrating Oriental history, or as affording some light to guide us in researches into the history of literature during what we are pleased to call the dark ages, we feel that an improved edition of the Chronicle of Abulfarage is calculated alike to interest the divine, the historian, and the philologist.

¹ Even the German translator of the Arabic Chronicle thought himself obliged to apologize for the baldness of his style; he begs his readers to remember that he could not beautify the original (*ich konnte das original nicht verschönern*). This translation was published at Leipzig, by George Laurenz Bauer, in 1788—5, in two 8vo. volumes.

ART. III.—1. *Food and its Adulterations; comprising the Reports of the Analytical Sanitary Commission of the 'Lancet,' for the Years 1851 to 1854 inclusive. Revised and extended. By ARTHUR HILL HASSALL, M.D.* London: Longmans.

2. *Adulteration of Food, Drink, and Drugs, being the Evidence taken before the Parliamentary Committee. Arranged and simplified.* London: David Bryce.

It is of the very essence of life, as our present experience enables us to comprehend it, to be absorbent of external matter. Everything that lives devours. Each kind of life has, indeed, its peculiar subject-matter, on which it exercises this universal condition of its being; but feed it must, or death is the result. All things change in this mundane condition, and every atom in organic bodies performs (see Hamlet) a multitude of circuits, which would make its history as varied as that of the great world itself. Whether our experience may ever be different; whether the state of things we see around us may be confined to the operations of time as opposed to eternity; whether there is, in fact, a deep and special meaning, beyond what its authors contemplated, in the expression, '*Tempus edax rerum*,' we must leave to those who speculate on the nature of spiritual beings, who dive into subjects wholly unseen. Our present task is with things not, indeed, easily discerned,—for the microscope is the necessary companion of all investigations such as Dr. Hassall reveals,—but still with distinctively physical arrangements, and with matter, strictly so speaking.

Having, then, established the truth that we absorb a continual succession of atoms in order to support life, we may next consider the general method by which all living substances perform this condition of their existence. There is a wonderful similarity throughout all nature in the process by which this is done, if we trace, in the different kinds of life, the functions and instincts of acquisition and digestion. These may be differently organized, or may act in different ways. What in one kind of life may be done simply by a mechanical process, may in a higher life be done by instinct, and in a higher still by the mind of man; but the same thing is nevertheless being done in all, as a condition of primary vitality;—certain *appropriate* atoms are being absorbed;—the qualities and substances which are *wanted* for each one's separate requirements are being taken in, with a marvellous power of adaptation between the means and the end; and, with the material thus introduced into the living workshop, there are ever being produced, so long as life endures, the

various consistencies, the forms, the colours, and the functional actions, which distinguish each living object, and give it an individual existence.

The process of absorption is the one most connected with our present subject; though still we must have an eye at the work done, at the result manifested, in order to test the good and fitness of the raw material. If a tree is not placed in an appropriate soil or climate, it withers and dies; if a lion cannot obtain flesh, it dies of want, though all nature may beam with life and plenty around it; while the giraffe or antelope might perish at an alderman's feast, unless it discerned a dish of green peas performing its circuit in the hands of a waiter. The primary art of living is to select those substances which most conduce to each one's separate welfare, that they may be applied to the full development of those objects for which it was created. In the case of vegetable life, this first process of selection is performed, under the mysterious guidance of its nature, by small fibrous roots acting in a mechanical manner. If we go a step higher to the inferior grades of animal life, we discover symptoms of voluntary action gradually developing themselves. The race of zoophytes absorb their feed with the smallest degree of intelligence that is conceivable, and thus afford an admirable link in the chain of that universal law which we are tracing through all descriptions of life. The worm and the leech suck in their subsistence by a process a little—but only a little—raised above the former in the growth of instinct. In the insect tribe, however, we have a great stride: the busy bee and the ant are proverbial for the depth of a wisdom which is not only intellectual, but even moral, as contrasted with the imagined thoughtlessness of the butterfly. What labour, what research, do the various orders of created beings exhibit, that rise one above another in the water, in the air, and on the face of the earth, from those already mentioned to the nobler animals! Some prowl in woods and deserts for flesh, or for the same living sustenance hang in mid air or mid water, waiting their opportunity when that which is fitting for the peculiar wants of their nature shall come within range; while others feed on the grass of the field, and patiently consume the requisite number of leafy atoms which their animal economy demands.

The point in all this, however, which now especially we would notice is, the amazing unerring nature of that instinct which guides each living thing to make a proper selection of its own diet. Would that human reason performed this work in all cases with the same truth, the same guileless integrity! But how in the human race is this work accomplished, which thus exquisitely may be traced in the separate habits of unreasoning

life? Man, it is true, does not as he stands on the ground absorb nourishment through the soles of his feet, as a tree does through its stem; he does not open out his stomach, like a zoophyte, for the reception of any morsel that may be wafted along in the stream of fortune; nor, like some of them, is he capable of being turned inside out, with perfect indifference as to which portion of the surface of his frame is applied to digestive, and which to ornamental purposes; he does not suck in vital nourishment from the blood of his neighbours, and thus transform himself into the similitude of a red currant, like a parasitical animal of the human race well known in all ill-regulated dormitories. He does not literally, however in a figurative sense he may strive to do so, suck honey from every flower. He does not range like a wolf, or graze like an ox; he does not, in fact, by his own individual labour or instinct, obtain those things which are needful for his life. The work is done by cooperation among his fellow-men; the task is divided, and each individual collects his own nutritive elements by means of his brother's labour, while he, if he is a useful member of society, contributes his portion in one or other of the many subdivisions.

It follows, then, from this, that man has to depend on his fellow-creatures rather than his own unassisted instincts. He has indeed fibres, multitudinous and intricate as any herb or tree, which draw in the atoms that are suitable for his support from the exterior world to his own private interior; but those fibres are not so much physical in their nature as moral, for they are to be traced through the habits, occupations, and interests of his fellow-creatures. The economy of human life requires this; and the more civilized he is, the more intricate is the tangled web of those fibrous roots which conduct his nourishment from a raw to a manufactured state.

If we view this system in its moral aspect, we see at once that man is made very dependent on the integrity and uprightness of his fellow-creatures. He has in a great measure to devour what is put into his hands by others. This mutual dependence on each other is typical, in Holy Writ, of our dependence on God Himself, and it is, indeed, part of our high condition as being under trial for an eternal blessedness. Our Lord illustrates that holy confidence which we are entitled to place in our prayers to Heaven, by the loving faithfulness with which our earthly parent avoids deception in the very point we are speaking of, viz. the supply of food which a child solicits and expects at his hand. 'What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?' A sacrilegious character is thus imparted to that betrayal of mutual confidence in the human

race, which results in the substitution of one article of food for another, in that every-day intercourse between man and man which is the foundation of civilized life. Every instinct and feeling we possess points with indignation to any tricks practised on human food, as a betrayal of the highest, and, at the same time, the most necessary confidences that we place in each other. No worse symptom can exist of entire rottenness in the moral habits of a people, than the discovery of, and still worse in the apologies for, fraud and adulteration in the common supplies of life. Solomon uttered loud complaints on the prevalence of what we may call the dishonesty of shops, when he said, 'Sin sticketh close between buying and selling;' and again when he solemnly pronounced the eternal truth, that 'A false balance is abomination to the Lord, but a just weight is His delight.' Nor do things appear to have ended when Hosea had occasion to write of Ephraim, 'He is a merchant; the balances of deceit are in his hand; he loveth to oppress.'

The English are a nation of traders, and to magnify their position as such, they are rather fond, at least their preachers are for them, of quoting the text, 'Whose merchants are princes, and whose traffickers are the honourable of the earth.' The mere quoting this text at the end of a rounded period in S. Paul's Cathedral, even though a bishop is the preacher and the Lord Mayor a listener, does not however establish the fact, that the application is altogether merited by the trading system of this country. Sinister revelations of the corrupt and demoralized state of commerce and trade come out one by one, but too many of them point to an opposite deduction. With influential banking firms we have no concern in reference to our present subject, except that dishonesty and roguery in the higher departments of commerce would make us very suspicious of the lower; and it happens unfortunately for our daily peace of mind, that recent investigations into the subject of meat and drink and also of drugs make it very obvious that there is a widely extended and wholesale deception practised upon the public by the trading world, in very many of the most important articles of consumption. The world is now fully alive to this subject, and therefore we wish to treat it temperately, for there is danger of exaggerated notions gaining possession of nervous minds, which may spoil their digestion from the mere force of imagination. Yet, as belonging to the great public, we must claim with a stern voice the duty of cultivating truth and honesty on the part of traders; and we cannot allow that common pretext which is brought forward for the more innocuous kind of adulterations, that the public prefer articles thus adapted to their taste and their means, and that they like being deceived. We must in

limine protest against any supposition of this kind, and take it to be an axiom of trade, which ought to be imperatively demanded, that words and names as representing substances must be held sacred, and that the act of selling one thing under the name of another thing constitutes deception, which should stamp every one privy to it as guilty of wilful falsehood, and as being a dishonourable man.

It began many years ago to be suspected that the trade of this country, as far as articles of food were concerned, was very largely tainted by certain dangerous *secrets*, which caused the public to be made unresisting victims to the interests of provision dealers, grocers, druggists, and brewers. Accum, in the year 1820, published a treatise on 'Culinary Poison' and 'Death in the Pot,' which he illustrated on the title-page with a significant hour-glass, and with other emblems of mortality. Since that time, however, the ingenuity of trade has made rapid strides, stimulated by the eager competition that has characterised this period. Things at length got to such a pass, that the subject was warmly taken up by the 'Lancet,' and a series of papers brought out, commencing in the year 1851, which are now published in a thick volume, by their author, Dr. Hassall, chief analyst of the commission. From periodical literature, the subject has been moved up to a committee of the House of Commons, before which various witnesses have been examined, whose evidence is now before us. The labours, however, of this committee are not concluded, and it stands over to next session. The present, therefore, is just the time for the public fairly and impartially to view the case as it now stands between the trade and the public. The trade, on its part, may justly claim of the public, that they shall not suppose individual or partial instances of dishonesty,—for this word we take to be analogous with adulteration,—to be taken as representing the practices of the whole trade; that stories about wonderful poisonings, copied from one book to another, may not be exaggerated far beyond what truth would justify; while the public on their part have a right to express very just indignation against the organized deceptions which have been practised on them; and to require, on such a delicate subject as human food and human medicine, that they who supply them shall give some guarantee of their probity and fair dealing.

It was no light task which the commission of inquiry, appointed by the 'Lancet,' undertook; either if we look on the mere labour of microscopic observation and chemical analysis, or the invidious character of a work, the object of which was to bring serious accusations against our fellow-countrymen. Yet, once begun, it was perseveringly continued, in spite of every obstacle.

The most unwearied care has been essential in order to avoid making false charges, which would throw discredit on the whole affair; but the very minuteness of the investigations thus rendered necessary, have produced their own reward, on scientific as well as economic grounds. The power of the microscope has been largely developed, and its use made to assume quite a new feature in social life. In conjunction with chemical analysis, a power is produced by these two, before which the very atoms of nature seem to be dissolved, and to portray their inmost character. Every known substance has its peculiar conformation, not only externally in its general shape, but in its smallest parts, such as require very large magnifying powers to discern. By this means we are, happily, enabled to get behind the secret arts and deceptions of trade, and discover whether ground coffee, for instance, is composed of the real article or of chicory, beans, burnt sugar, or other substances. The cunning and artifice with which adulteration has long been carried on, have at length met their equal in the penetrating glances of science, and we have more security than before against being compelled to swallow the rubbish that has too often passed for invigorating food.

But is it not humiliating to reflect that all this research of science is to penetrate, not so much into the secrets of nature, as to get behind the scenes of certain human operations which are going on all around us? It would appear that every trade has its secrets of adulteration and sophistication,—kept as dark, unknown, as any of the occult sciences of old. To ‘learn a trade,’ too often means to be instructed in certain regular practices of deceit and lying. It is almost a maxim of modern retail commerce, that the margin of profit must be worked out by a man’s own ingenuity in distributing to the public an inferior article to that which he himself procures. It has been proved, in many cases, that the retail price of articles is less than the wholesale; which of course implies that the purchaser has other substances than those he asked for, palmed off upon him. Perhaps the worst sign in the whole affair, is the serious way in which adulteration is defended; and the use of words and names made, as it were, private property, in their use or possession transferable; even by so-called ‘respectable tradesmen,’ and in one case by a witness before the Committee of the House of Commons. If Mr. Wallington’s evidence thus given at all represents the morality of English trade, it is certainly high time that the public should adopt some means of protecting itself. Let us quote his own words:—

‘There is no understanding between the public and the seller that the seller shall give you what you ask for; neither do I think it beneficial that it should be so.’—*Parl. Ev.* p. 219.

Again,—

‘Adding innocuous adulterating substances to other articles with a view to reduce their price is what I entirely justify.’—*Parl. Ec.* p. 220.

These sentiments are expressed at greater length, with more elaborate sophistries, and even with some adornment from poetic philosophy:—

‘I think it is justifiable to mix any foreign substance with an article which is about to be sold, and sell the mixture at the same price at which you would sell the genuine article, provided the trade can get that price; but I do not believe that they can obtain an excessive price for any article. I think the public are sufficiently protected by competition. Competition does not enable the public to know that an article is adulterated; neither do I think it necessary that it should. I think it is sufficient for the public if they get the article, whatever it is, at the cheapest price. “What the eye never sees, the heart never grieves for,” is the rule which I should adopt in reference to that.’—*Parl. Ec.* p. 220.

We are certainly of opinion that it is the duty of an honest tradesman to supply what he is asked for, unmixed with any other material. Mr. Wallington, however, is equally instructive and original in his theory of names as representing substances:—

‘There is nothing in a name; he procures an article which answers, according to my belief, the purposes for which the public require it, or they would not use it.’—*Parl. Ec.* p. 221.

But it is on the subject of isinglass that he is most warm in maintaining the liberty of words unbridled by any mediæval, and, to his mind, obsolete restrictions. In the following extracts from his evidence, there is a sublimity of logic that must astonish the majority of retail traders, and at the same time a simplicity of frankness for which his friends will hardly thank him. Let the reader bear in mind that gelatine is usually the produce of the knacker’s yard:—

‘The name isinglass, in itself, represents nothing; it is merely an article sold which is taken from the bladder of a fish, which contains gelatine, which is denominated isinglass; and any person in the nineteenth century has as much right to take the same gelatine, which is equally pure, and even better in all respects, and call it isinglass, as a person in the thirteenth century had to take a fish’s bladder, and, for some reason or other, give it the name of isinglass. If you prevent that class of dealing, namely, the substitution of articles, you strike a blow immediately at trade and at competition, which is the nucleus of trade.’—*Parl. Ec.* p. 223.

It is not with this philosophic dignity, this imperial audacity of insolence, that the more vulgar adepts at adulterations defend their art, or repel any insinuations as to the propriety of their conduct. Dr. Normandy says:—

‘When I was beginning these investigations, I was foolish enough to go to the parties occasionally and tell them, “Really, this is very bad;” but generally they abused me, and therefore I gave up the remonstrance. They began to use offensive language. I went to this person in the Kingsland-road; I said, “This is too bad; you are putting an enormous quantity of

chicory in your coffee;" and he said, "What is that to you?" and began to speak offensively, and I left.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 68.

On another occasion his microscopic investigations were responded to by 'a very offensive expression about his eyes,' which made him beat a precipitate retreat; convinced that fair remonstrance was a very inadequate mode of meeting the great evil of the present age, on the subject before us.

Of the mass of valuable and interesting research collected by Dr. Hassall, it would far exceed our limits to give any general review. It must ever remain a book of warning to the one side, and of comfort to the other. The little circular illustrations with which it abounds—showing, under a magnifying power of 420 times the natural size, the minutest conformation of all the common substances that admit of being adulterated, as well as of those with which they are adulterated—are a hint to the trade that their devices will be no longer in the dark; but that the public have access behind the screen of professional mysticism, by which they were so long deceived. The exposures also of the vast amount of adulteration actually practised—exposures which the trade have never dared to contradict—must show to all the world that the work of scientific scrutiny is really practical, and can be applied to useful purposes.

It is obvious that the articles most subject to adulteration are those which the public buy in a prepared, as opposed to a raw state. This consideration points out the serious check which is put to the refinements as well as the economy of life, by the prevailing dishonesty of tradesmen. It is the characteristic of savage life to deal in raw and unprepared substances of diet; whereas the higher arts of civilization are capable, by the superior skill of those who make it their special occupation, to combine great economy of labour with a better style of living. So long, however, as professional persons are not to be trusted, the public are thrown on the necessity of living, as, in fact, the middle and lower classes in this country do, on the simplest elements of nature, prepared, each household for itself, in a rude, and at the same time, wasteful manner. Whenever this system is departed from; whenever the delicacies of foreign diet are attempted; whenever imported articles of luxury are sought for; it is at the peril of being made to swallow the most deceptive, and often trashy, if not unwholesome substances.

The general effects of adulteration are thus well described by Dr. Hassall:—

'But adulteration makes not only those who practise it dishonest, but other very serious evils ensue. Thus, it begets the greatest mistrust on the part of the buyer, who loses confidence in those with whom he deals, and in this way sometimes the honest trader comes to be looked upon with the same suspicion as the adulterating merchant, manufacturer, or tradesman. Another consequence is, that the status of that portion of the trading com-

munity which sells articles of consumption is lowered, and is locked upon with misgiving in all its transactions. Lastly, the character of the whole nation suffers in consequence of the prevalence of adulteration. The character of this country has certainly suffered, to some extent, in consequence of the disclosures contained in the reports embodied in this work. In proof of this statement, we have only to refer to those foreign journals, principally German and French, in which the Reports of the Analytical Sanitary Commission are noticed, and nearly all the Reports were thus noticed from time to time as they appeared. These notices were not unfrequently accompanied with remarks anything but flattering to our integrity. One notice, we remember, alluding particularly to our being a nation of shop-keepers, observed that we appeared to have strong claims for being regarded as a nation of rogues.—*Hassall*, p. xxxv.

It is time, however, we go into detail, and quote from the words of Mr. Hassall, and also from the evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons. Mr. Hassall, in his introduction, says as follows:—

‘The adulterations practised differ in kind as well as in degree. One form of adulteration consists in the addition of substances usually of greatly inferior value, for the sake of bulk and weight, the choice being determined by the cheapness of the substitute, and its fitness for the peculiar adulteration required. This is the principal and most frequent description of adulteration practised.

‘Another form of adulteration consists in the addition of colouring matters of various kinds, with a view to heighten the colour, and, as it is considered, to improve the appearance of the articles, as well as to conceal other forms of adulteration. This is a very prevalent adulteration, and it is the most objectionable and reprehensible of all, because substances are frequently employed, for the purpose of imparting colour, possessing highly deleterious and even in some cases poisonous properties, as various preparations of lead, copper, mercury, and arsenic. Of the use of these substances many instances are recorded in the pages of this work.

‘A third description of adulteration consists in the admixture of substances for the purpose of imparting smell, flavour, pungency, and other properties.’—*Hassall*, p. iii.

The chief articles commonly adulterated are all those various things which are sold by grocers; it is this class, therefore, of traders who deserve most censure. Bakers are also guilty of a most extended and uniform system of deceiving the public. Articles of drink, principally beer and gin, are also much tampered with; and, worse than all, the dishonesty of inferior druggists is proved to be very injurious to the health of those persons who do not obtain their medicines from first-class establishments; for it is but fair to say that the chemists patronized by the rich are, on the whole, far above any wilful adulterations, and do their best to sell pure articles.

One of the most difficult articles to obtain in a pure state is coffee. It is adulterated with the following substances:—chicory, roasted wheat, rye, and potato flours, burnt beans, acorns, mangel-wurzel; while the chicory thus used is itself adulterated with carrot, saw-dust, mahogany saw-dust, and

burnt sugar. It would appear as if there resided in the bosom of the coffee trade a fixed determination not to allow the public the satisfaction of pure coffee. The principle is most boldly defended, and many persons are induced to sanction it, as regards chicory, by an imagined preference for this mixture over coffee in a pure state. The English, in fact, do not know what coffee is; so long as a hot and dark-coloured liquid is on the breakfast-table, which passes under the name of coffee, they are perfectly satisfied, and never miss the essential qualities of that exquisite berry, which operates, if allowed to do so, in a highly refreshing and beneficial manner on the human frame. The difference between coffee and chicory is thus defined:—

‘The active principles of tea and coffee are “theine” and “caffeine,”—highly nitrogenised substances, possessed of extraordinary influence on the nervous system; and, by means of chemistry, the remarkable discovery has been made that these two bodies are identical. It is thus seen how correct has been the almost universal practice of mankind in making use of tea and coffee,—a practice not based on science in the first instance, but resulting solely from experience.

‘Chicory, on the contrary, is the root of a plant. Now, roots in general are remarkable rather for nutritious properties than for any active or medicinal qualities; and of this we find a very sufficient explanation, in the fact of their exclusion from light and heat, the great agents in the elaboration of all the more active organic principles.

‘The cells of chicory-root, unlike those of the coffee-berry, do not contain any essential oil, and the plant, moreover, is wholly destitute of the active principle of coffee,—viz., caffeine; it being described as somewhat resembling in its medicinal properties, taraxacum or dandelion, being slightly tonic, but chiefly aperient; these properties, however, are probably almost entirely destroyed by the roasting.

‘It is therefore obvious that *chicory root is no substitute for coffee*, since it so completely wants the peculiar fragrance and the invaluable stimulant qualities of that berry.

‘Of the inferiority of chicory the observer may easily convince himself by preparing hot infusions of chicory and coffee separately, and then carefully contrasting their more obvious properties: the one has little or no fragrance, a sweetish and mawkish taste, and is dark-coloured, thick, and glutinous; the perfume of the other is rich and exhilarating, the taste agreeable, and the liquid bright and transparent.’—*Hassall*, pp. 8, 9.

The following hints are those given to coffee-drinkers:—

‘Thus every person who desires to have good coffee should attend to the following points.

‘Except of tradesmen of unquestionable integrity, he should never buy ground coffee, but should procure the roasted berry: in choosing this, care should be taken to notice that it be not too dark, for if so it has been too much roasted, and some of its active properties have been injured or destroyed. It should be ground to rather a fine powder, as this, by setting free the essential oil contained in the cells, allows more readily of the action of water upon it. Immediately on being reduced to powder, it should be placed in a tin canister. Lastly, an *infusion*, and not a *decoction*, of the berry should be made, as during the process of boiling the active principles, and especially the delicate aroma, are in part dissipated. By

attending to these directions, not only will good coffee be obtained, but "a heavy blow and great discouragement" inflicted on the adulterators of coffee.

'Above all, the coffee-drinker should never buy the coffee contained in canisters; for he may be assured that it is even more adulterated than other coffee, as it is necessary not only that the purchaser pay for the coffee, but also for the canister itself.'—*Hassall*, p. 9.

The home grinding of coffee is, however, a great inconvenience in small houses, and it certainly is a great hardship imposed on the public that we should be deprived of the advantage of getting ground coffee unless we submit to these trashy adulterations. Nor are we perfectly safe, however, if we buy coffee whole. A machine was actually registered some time back for pressing lumps of chicory into the shape of coffee-berries. Most inferior berries can also, by the aid of burnt sugar, be passed off at a far higher price than they are worth to the consumer.

The absurd 'puffs' about their coffee, published by inferior grocers, occupy a considerable space in the pages of the Report. The 'puff' is given *in extenso*, and then the result of analysis on the article thus favourably described. Take the following as a specimen of the truthfulness of coffee-dealers. First, read the prefatory announcement:—

'At the present time, when the public mind is agitated by all the conceivable contrivances which the ingenuity of interested men and selfish motives can suggest, we deem it proper to call attention to the FACT, that we have always declared our readiness to GRIND OUR COFFEE under the immediate inspection of those of our customers who are tenacious of chicory. And now, to demonstrate and give publicity to our *fair dealing system*, we have placed *one of our mills in the window*, so that the most incredulous cannot but feel satisfied that they have a genuine article.

'We do not deprecate the moderate use of chicory with the finer description of coffee, as by that means a delightful beverage is brought within the reach of the poorer classes; but we do *condemn* the fallacious conduct of those who, under pretence of selling pure coffee, charge an exorbitant price, when, in reality, they vend an article adulterated to an extent never thought of by their less bombastic neighbours. Still we acknowledge that the people of this country have a right to expect a supply of genuine coffee, if they pay a price which will yield the retailer a fair profit; and we therefore invite all to our establishment, pledging ourselves to supply them with a wholesome beverage.'—*Hassall*, p. 172.

Now for the analysis:—'Adulterated with a large quantity of chicory.'

In other puffs we find the words 'Delicious;' 'Aromatic Flavour;' 'Extraordinary Coffee;' 'Rush of Consumers;' 'Grateful Beverage;' 'Genuine Coffee;' 'No Chicory;' followed by the stern Dr. Hassall's concise analysis, in words such as the following:—'Adulterated with chicory, which forms near one-half the sample.' 'Containing very little coffee,' 'With a considerable quantity of chicory, and a vegetable substance closely

'resembling horse-chestnut.' 'Chief ingredient, chicory. Cold infusion, highly and unnaturally coloured.' 'Containing numerous fragments of some amorphous substance.' Out of thirty-four samples, only three were pure, the adulteration being thus classified :—

'That chicory was present in thirty-one instances; roasted corn in twelve; beans and potato-flour, each in one case. That in sixteen cases the adulteration consisted of chicory only; that in the remaining fifteen samples the adulteration consisted of chicory, and either roasted corn, beans or potatoes. That in many instances the quantity of coffee present was very small; and in others, it formed one-fifth, fourth, third, half, and so on, of the whole article.'—*Hassall*, p. 179.

Canister coffee is the worst of all, especially such as is described as possessing a 'rich aroma.' Compare the following puff with its analysis :—

'This beautiful compound of coffee gives that rich aroma so highly appreciated by continental travellers, produces a beverage strong, bright, and clear, is rich and mellow in flavour, and must be appreciated by all the LOVERS OF A CUP OF GOOD COFFEE.

'This coffee, being roasted on the most improved principle, which confines all that fragrance (which evaporates with the common roaster) so delightful and pleasing to the palate, and being packed hot, both from roasting and grinding, in well-seasoned canisters, which being perfectly air-tight will keep for any reasonable length of time, or in any climate, without the least injury to its original flavour; offering at once a canister of the finest compound of coffees ever imported into Europe.'—*Hassall*, p. 185.

'Adulterated—scarcely any coffee; nearly all chicory and mangel-wurzel.'

One more of the same kind :—

'This peculiarly fine, rich, old mellow-flavoured coffee, being packed in air-tight tins immediately it is roasted and ground, will retain its freshness and exquisite fragrance any length of time.'—*Hassall*, p. 190.

'Adulterated—with chicory, and containing a few particles resembling acorn.'

The permission recently given to coffee-dealers to sell it mixed with chicory, if they label their packages accordingly, does not appear to have secured to the public a fair choice as to whether they prefer it thus adulterated or not. Dr. Hassall, in his evidence before the Committee, states as follows :—

'From an examination of thirty-four samples of coffee purchased shortly after the recent regulation authorizing the sale of mixed chicory and coffee in labelled packages, out of the thirty-four samples, all purchased as coffee, only three were genuine, while no less than thirty-one contained various proportions of chicory; in six of the samples chicory was present in the proportion of about one-third of the article; in twenty-two of the samples chicory formed about one-half of the article; three of the samples consisted almost entirely of chicory; thirteen were not labelled "Mixture of chicory and coffee," and yet ten of these were adulterated with chicory.'—*Parl. Ev.* pp. 7, 8.

Of the adulterations of chicory itself, he further says:—

‘In thirty-four samples of chicory, fourteen were adulterated; in nine with roasted corn; scorched beans were present in four of the samples; in one a substance resembling ground acorn. In a second series of samples, twenty-three in number, eleven, or one-half, were adulterated; four with roasted wheat; the substance like ground acorn was present in an equal number of cases; three contained sawdust; mangel-wurzel was detected in one of the chicories; and in one, roasted carrot. In the microscopical examination of chicory, out of eighteen samples procured from manufactories, five were adulterated with roasted wheat-flour; several yielded a coloured ash; out of the sixteen samples of chicory purchased at the establishments of different grocers in the metropolis, only one was adulterated with roasted farina; the ashes of several indicated the presence of some red ferruginous earth, as ruddle and Venetian red.’—*Parl. Ev.* pp. 10, 11.

The peculiar principle of tea and coffee we have already seen to be identical. Lo-Yü, a learned Chinese, gives the following description of the qualities of tea:—

‘It tempers the spirits, and harmonises the mind; dispels lassitude, and relieves fatigue; awakens thought, and prevents drowsiness; lightens or refreshes the body, and clears the perceptive faculties.’—*Hassall*, p. 272.

Now, it is obvious that to produce these intellectual results, which Dr. Johnson so highly appreciated, we must have the genuine article. Nature is not so prodigal of her charms as to scatter this refreshing and stimulating quality on every shrub that grows around us. Dr. Hassall states, that tea is generally unadulterated when it arrives in this country, but mark the ingenuity which then operates upon it:—

‘It has been repeatedly ascertained that the leaves of various British plants are sometimes used in this country in the adulteration of tea.

‘The leaves of the following species have been detected from time to time in samples of tea of British fabrication:—beech, elm, horse-chestnut, plane, bastard-plane, fancy oak, willow, poplar, hawthorn, and sloe.

‘The leaves are dried, broken into small pieces, and usually mixed up with a paste made of gum and catechu; afterwards they are ground and reduced to a powder, which, when coloured with rose-pink, is mixed either with the dust of genuine tea, or with inferior descriptions of black tea.’—*Hassall*, p. 273.

It is also a common practice to buy up old tea-leaves, and prepare them again for sale by the aid of glazing, and also by mixing them up with inferior tea. The following is a description of the process:—

‘There was an extensive furnace, before which was suspended an iron pan, containing sloe-leaves and tea-leaves, which they were in the practice of purchasing from coffee-shop keepers, after being used. On searching the place, they found an immense quantity of used tea, bay-leaves, and every description of spurious ingredients, for the purpose of manufacturing illicit tea, and they were mixed with a solution of gum and a quantity of copperas. The heat of the place was so excessive, that the officers could scarcely remain in it, but the prisoners did not seem at all oppressed by it. The woman was employed in stirring about the bay-leaves and other compositions with the solution of gum in the pan; and in one part of the room there was a large quantity of spurious stuff, the exact imitation of

genuine tea. In a back room they found nearly 100 lbs. weight of re-dried tea-leaves, bay-leaves, and sloe-leaves, all spread on the floor drying.'—*Hassall*, p. 289.

Nor can any one be secure if he buys a chest of tea, as he imagines, direct from China; the chest, indeed, may be the same, but the tea different:—

'A large tea-dealer (and it is surprising to see how the most respectable men will sometimes do that which is not right) met me in Fenchurch-street, and he said, "Doctor, I want you to come and see what beautiful seams the tea-chests are closed with." The tea-chest as it comes from the warehouse is closed, and there is only a hole cut about the size of the hand, for the purpose of taking out a sample. He showed me a seam of the cover, which was a very beautiful sheet of lead, exceedingly thin. It appears that great endeavours had been made to open the chests, for the purpose of making suitable mixtures, and to repack them, and make that beautiful seam which the Chinese make, and it appeared that application having been made to many of the tinsmiths in this country, they could not reproduce that seam; that is to say, in attempting to resolder it they melted the lead, and the operation was spoilt. I saw a room, which was perfectly clean, boarded with very clean boards, and it had heaps of teas piled up against the wall, and there was a rope against the wall, which served the following purpose. It appears that the chests are only permitted to be cut open sufficiently to put the hand in and take a sample, and it is through this hole the whole of the chest is emptied on the floor. A mixture is made on the floor with teas of a very inferior quality; some of which I have examined, which yield an infusion with about as much taste as an infusion of brown paper. This is thrown upon the floor and mixed with magnesia and Prussian-blue; and then the question comes, how they can reintroduce it into the original chest from which it was taken; and it is done in this way: a small quantity of tea is put in the chest; a man puts his foot upon the hole, grasps the rope, and by a series of jerks he succeeds in packing it up tight, and so he goes on with another layer, and the pounding process is repeated till the chest is eventually filled up as tight as if it had not been touched. This I know from personal observation, and I understood that all persons do it; so that a man who buys a chest of tea is under a great delusion if he thinks he is secure from fraud.'—*Parl. Ec.* pp. 60, 61.

The evidence of Mr. Phillips is as follows, in which, indeed, he is supported by many others:—

'In tea, as imported, I have found gum, indigo, a vegetable yellow (I cannot say exactly what it was); Prussian-blue, which is rare; carbonate of magnesia, sulphate of lime and silica. In the tea made up in this country, I found re-dried tea-leaves; other leaves—namely, beech, elm, bastard-plane, fancy oak, and willow, made up to represent green tea with gum, Dutch-pink, Prussian-blue, indigo, carbonate of magnesia, French chalk, and sulphate of lime. When dried leaves and re-dried tea has been made up to represent black tea, I have found gum outside the leaf just coated over with rose-pink to give it a bloom. Foreign leaves are broken up very small, and sifted through a sieve; they are then gathered up by means of gum-water, and rolled into pieces, sometimes to represent the caper tea, sometimes coarse gunpowder; they are then faced over with colouring matter made of the blue and yellow substances I have named; and bloomed, by being put into a bag with a little carbonate of magnesia, French chalk, or sulphate of lime.'—*Parl. Ec.* p. 206.

The mass of tea sold as green is only made so by a direct process of painting, the colouring material being 'Prussian-blue, turmeric, and a white material, which seemed to be a mixture of soapstone with sulphate of lime.' The yellow and blue colours when mixed form a green, and white is added either to lessen the intensity of the former colour, or else to give polish to the surface of the leaves. Verdigris, arsenite of copper, Dutch-pink, and vegetable dye, and other substances, are also used for the same purpose, many of which are most injurious to health. We cannot, therefore, commend green tea to our readers. The difference in the colour is supposed to have its origin in the first preparation of the leaf in China:—

'The black tea undergoes a fermentation; they cannot dry it black unless it has undergone that process. They very often make green and black tea from the same plant; if we take a plant which is rich in nitrogen, and allow it to ferment a little, if we attempt to dry that, it dries brown or black, but if we dry it immediately it is gathered it dries green.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 49.

Practically, however, with ourselves, the difference is merely deceptive, and the green colour is often very unwholesome in its qualities. 'Fine young Hyson,' when submitted to a minute examination, is described as follows, 'Leaves twisted, wiry, glossy, and of a greyish-blue colour, faced with Prussian-blue, turmeric-powder, and China clay.' Whole pages full of these same results are before us, with the names of the tea-dealers from whom the samples were obtained. The trade may almost be said to be one great lie in all its lower branches; and indeed all persons who can afford it have been aware of this, and have ceased to procure tea except from large merchants, whom they can trust with more confidence than the shopkeeper near, who, at a higher price, would inevitably furnish an inferior and adulterated article.

On the subject of sugar, a new element is introduced into our calculations. We have not to complain so much of the mixture of foreign substances with it, as of the want of care in the mode of preparation for the market; a want of care which not only saves expense, but in a more direct way adds largely to the weight, and thereby to the profit of the article. Flour indeed, is occasionally found mixed with sugar, but there is a more frequent intrusion of an organic description in the shape of disgusting insects, called *acari*. Fragments of cane also from the original manufacturer, which by proper purification ought to have been cleared out, are found very generally in large quantities, though very minute in size. Sporules of fungi also abound in the less pure kinds of sugar. In white or lump sugar these are never found, and this form is by far the most cleanly

in every respect, the adulteration which exists in it being less offensive. Cases, however, occur even in these sugars, where not only are there vast quantities of woody fibres, but where the clarifying process, which it has to undergo, is the occasion for introducing corrupt animal matter into it. We trust, however, that this is not common:—

‘The employment of the blood of animals is confined to the manufacture of loaf-sugar, and its use, we believe, is now very frequently dispensed with, even in the preparation of this article.

‘The blood acts only through the albumen which it contains: now, we have just said, that one of the great difficulties of sugar-refining arose from the presence of vegetable albumen in the cane-juice; and here we have the apparent contradiction involved in the practice of putting albumen into the solution of sugar.

‘The advantages derived from the use of this substance, we presume, are considered to more than counterbalance the disadvantages attending it; and indeed it would appear that there is not the same difficulty in the removal of animal albumen as is experienced in the abstraction of vegetable albumen.

‘The mode of its operation is as follows: the fluid albumen is diffused throughout the whole of the sugar-solution to be clarified; on the application of heat, the albumen immediately solidifies, and forms meshes and films, which, being lighter than the water, ascend, and in their upward course carry with them the solid impurities contained in the solution, on the surface of which a scum is gradually formed, consisting of the impurities in question and the solidified albumen: this scum may be removed by skimming.

‘Now, as it is the albumen of the blood only which assists in clarifying the sugar solution, and not the blood itself, it would be far better that albumen alone, as white of egg, should in all cases be employed.’—*Hassall*, pp. 16, 17.

The *acarus*, however, though excluded from lump-sugar, revels wildly in coarse soft sugar. Its history is thus told:—

‘The *Acarus sacchari* is first visible as a rounded body, or egg; this gradually enlarges and becomes elongated and cylindrical, until it is about twice as long as broad; after a time, from the sides, and one extremity of this ovum, the legs and proboscis begin to protrude.

‘The *acarus* thus far formed, goes on increasing in size until it attains its full growth, when it is visible to the naked eye as a mere speck.

‘In its perfect state, its structure is as follows:—The body is oval, or rather somewhat ovate, being broader behind than before; from its posterior part four long and stiff bristles proceed, two together on each side; and some eight or ten smaller ones are arranged nearly at equal distances around the circumference of the body; from its anterior part a proboscis of complex organization proceeds, and from its inferior surface eight legs, jointed and furnished with spines or hairs at each articulation; the spine which issues from the last joint but one of each leg is very long, and extends much beyond the termination of the leg itself; lastly, each leg is armed at its extremity with a formidable hook.’—*Hassall*, pp. 17, 18.

It is supposed that this animal produces what is called the ‘grocer’s itch,’ a most unpleasant eruption of the skin, which is found to ensue from the handling of sugar—a process very

requisite in the preparation of it for sale. In thirty-three out of thirty-six samples of sugar these animals were found, sometimes in great numbers, counted by hundreds, and said to be *swarming*. Dr. Hassall sums up his notice of sugar as follows:—

‘We have now adduced incontestable evidence of the impure condition of the majority of brown sugars, as imported into this country, and particularly as vended to the public. These impurities prevail to such an extent, and are of such a nature,—consisting of live animalculæ or acari, sporules of fungus, starch, grit, woody-fibre, grape-sugar, &c.,—that we feel compelled, however reluctantly, to come to the conclusion, that *the brown sugars of commerce are, in general, in a state wholly unfit for human consumption.*

‘One portion of our advice to the public must therefore be, not to purchase the inferior brown sugars of the shops.

‘We have also clearly shown that lump-sugar is free from the greater part of the impurities and adulterations by which brown sugar is so largely contaminated and deteriorated; it does not contain *acari*, fungi, grape-sugar, albumen, or grit, the chief impurities consisting of starch granules and microscopic chips or fragments of woody-fibre.

‘We recommend, therefore, the more general use of refined or lump-sugar.’—*Hassall*, p. 31.

The subject of bread is treated by Dr. Hassall at considerable length, and in a very interesting manner. The diseases to which wheat is subject are explained with great fulness, and many discoveries related which were never made till recent microscopic operations assumed their practical position with reference to human food. There is a specific disease called Ergotism, resulting in terrible gangrene, which has been known to become epidemic after a wet harvest, in which the corn has produced ergot largely. The liability of wheat to disease, however, can hardly be called adulteration, but it leads to it by making it necessary to use alum in order to disguise the inferior quality of flour. Potatoes used to be in great request for the adulteration of flour, but they are now too expensive to make it worth while, and it would not appear that any other adulteration except that of alum is extensively employed. To this, however, all bakers and millers adhere most pertinaciously. It has several uses; it makes flour white, even though its quality is inferior, and it causes the bread to absorb large quantities of water, and thereby to increase its weight. All the witnesses agree on this point, and the only question which remains to be considered is, whether the public choose any longer to be cheated in this habitual and systematic way. It would not appear that alum is directly injurious to health if used moderately; but it is an imposition, and bread can be made very well without it, if the flour is good, and care be taken. The making of bread, however, brings us to the interesting investigations on the subject of yeast which have recently been made.

Yeast, it would seem, is a kind of fungus, of very rapid growth, and for this reason is liable to be spoilt or killed by mechanical injury. It consists of a number of sporules, which are developed one from another in various stages of perfection:—

‘I have myself,’ that gentleman writes, ‘examined yeast at Messrs. Hanbury and Buxton’s brewery at various stages of the fermentation of both porter and ale, from a few hours to many days. In the more advanced stages of fermentation, I observed the globules of yeast were frequently in strings or rows, apparently forming moniliform, often branched plants. But as the cells or joints were very readily separable, I could not satisfy myself that the adhesion was otherwise than mechanical, such as we see between the blood-discs when they arrange themselves in series like money-rolls, and such as we sometimes perceive even in inorganic amorphous precipitates. My experience agrees precisely with that of Schlossberger, who states that he “never could perceive a budding or bursting of the yeast-cells, accompanied by a discharge of their contents, nor could I ever produce this by compression. These curious brachial and other adjustments of the cells of yeast to each other appeared to me the work of chance.”’—*Hassall*, p. 153.

M. Robin pursued this investigation:—

‘We know only this mode of propagation of this vegetable; but its fructification in the air has not been seen, not can it be seen, because it perishes from the part at which it is in contact with the atmosphere; so that we cannot yet say whether it ought to be classed amongst the fungi which fructify only in the air, or even amongst the algae, from which it is separated by very many particulars, and which fructify under the water.’—*Hassall*, pp. 153, 154.

It has remained, however, for Dr. Hassall to trace the development of this plant through all its stages:—

‘*First Stage, or that of Sporules.*—In this, the ordinary state in which the yeast-plant is met with, it consists entirely of sporules; these are for the most part separate, but sometimes feebly united in twos, threes, and even in greater numbers; they vary in size and form; some are several times smaller than others, and nearly all contain one or two nuclei, which are the germs of future sporules.

‘*Second Stage, or that of Thallus.*—After the lapse of some days, and under favourable circumstances, the sporules become much elongated; a division or partition appears in each, and it now consists of two distinct cells; the extension still continuing, other septa appear, until at length jointed threads, at first simple and undivided, afterwards jointed, are formed, and the plant now exists in the form of root-like threads or *thallus*.

‘The yeast-plant in the state of thallus constitutes the *Mycoderma Cerevisiæ* of Desmazières.

‘*Third Stage, or that of Aërial Fructification.*—After the lapse of a further time, vertical threads spring up from the thallus; these, when the plant has reached its complete development, become branched, each branch bearing at its extremity a row of rounded and beaded corpuscles.

‘These corpuscles are about the size of the original yeast sporules, but differ from those bodies in their darker colour and firmer texture.

‘Occasionally in the rows of beaded corpuscles one cell several times larger than the rest is seen.

'From observation made subsequently on the development of the sugar fungus in saccharine wine, it appears that the beaded threads do not form the last condition or stage in the development of the plant, but that true aerial tufts or heads of sporules are formed.'—*Hassall*, pp. 154, 155.

The *modus operandi* of yeast is thus explained:—

'The presence of yeast in a substance containing sugar, or starch convertible into sugar and nitrogenised matter, induces certain chemical changes, comprehended under the term vinous or alcoholic fermentation.

'These changes in the making of bread consist in the conversion of the sugar of flower into alcohol and carbonic acid gas; the latter, in its efforts to escape from the dough with which it is mixed, distends it, forming vesicular spaces in its interior, and so causing it to become porous and light.'—*Hassall*, pp. 155, 156.

Fraud is indiscriminate in its operations; it attacks the weak as well as the stronger moments of life. In no cases, perhaps, is it more absurdly audacious than in advertising all those delicate farinaceous foods, which are supposed to be peculiarly beneficial for mothers and infants, and indeed for all persons in less robust health than usual. Advertisements are put forth with various attractive words, such as 'Ervallenta,' or 'Revalenta Arabica,' promising health and strength to the invalid; professing that these substances have the most valuable medicinal as well as nutritious qualities, and are specially adapted to procure all manner of blessings to 'mothers and infants.' We cannot fill our pages with the trash that is written in explanation of the professed qualities of these 'light and nutritious foods;' but for one or two of Dr. Hassall's analyses we must find room. The Arabian Revalenta, sold at a shilling a pound, 'consists of lentil-powder, the colour being such as would be produced by a mixture of the two species of lentil, the red and the yellow.' Lentil is a kind of bean, the flour of which is cheaper than barley flour, being only worth one penny and a fraction a-pound. It is used in workhouses by very ingenious economists, yet in other shapes it is often sold to the rich as high as two shillings and sixpence a-pound! So true is it, that extremes meet.

Another article, said to be protected by 'royal letters patent,' and to contain 'nitrogenous matter, indispensably requisite for nourishment, of which sago, &c. are devoid,' and to be wonderfully adapted for children and weak digestion, consists, on analysis, 'entirely of rice, reduced to an extremely fine powder.' Baster's Prince and Princess's farinaceous food, 'for the safety of infants from the hour of birth,' is still more simple. It consists of 'wheat flour sweetened with sugar.'

The whole catalogue of spices are most actively submitted to this uniform adulteration that disgraces our trade. Mustard can hardly be obtained in a pure state; it is *weakened* with flour, and

then coloured with turmeric. Pepper, ginger, and mixed spice are cooked up in the same way, while cayenne is coloured with red lead and vermilion. Preserved fruits and pickles are made green with copper, while anchovy sauce derives its colour from red ferruginous earth, as bole Armenian and Venetian red, which are neither more nor less than so much dirt.

As all powdered substances admit of adulteration more readily than solids, so are liquids still more at the mercy of various deceptive arts. Milk, beer, and gin, the national drinks of England, are uniformly *prepared* with great ingenuity for the public taste, as also for the profit of the seller. The first process of adulteration is very simple with all these liquids. They are largely diluted with water. In the case of the former and more innocent beverage, it would not appear that the poverty occasioned by the addition of water is very generally remedied; chalk being very seldom used. With the two others, however, the case is different. The publican is a man of many secret arts; on which, indeed, he depends for the profit of his trade. Ale and porter, as they come from the brewer, are generally said to be pure and unadulterated, while it is in the publican's cellar that the process goes on. After the porter is diluted, it requires flavour and richness of colour to be added to it by chemical ingredients. For this purpose there were, at one time, regular brewer's druggists, but now, it would seem, the publican does not employ any one in so open a way, but obtains the adulterating articles quietly and secretly. So acknowledged, however, has it long been, that some adulterations must be made, that treatises have been written on the subject:—

‘I obtained a letter of introduction to two of the largest druggists in London, and from them I heard that *cocculus indicus*, foots sugar, liquor ammoniac, and extract of gentian, were constantly sold by them to publicans for the purpose of adulterating beer. . . .

‘*Cocculus indicus* is a poisonous substance; it contains about two per cent. of the poison called *picrotoxine*; it is used, I understand, by poachers for destroying pheasants and fish. There is no doubt that this poisonous substance is occasionally used by brewers for the purpose of causing a species of inebriety which should be due to alcohol. . . .

‘By the addition of water, not only have they diminished its sweetness, but they have also diminished its colour; and they then put a little liquor ammoniac, or spirits of hartshorn, which has the property of darkening beer, so much so, that if you add a little ammonia to pale ale, it will become the colour of porter. Instead of hops, extract of gentian is used. Gentian is not a deleterious substance; it is introduced merely because the beer has been diluted, and it is no longer so bitter as it should be, and therefore a little extract of gentian is introduced. Indeed, I am given to understand that the chief sale of gentian is to publicans. It is cheaper than hops. I have been able to discover the proportion of water there is in beer, by detecting the quantity of alcohol; you judge of the quantity of water added from the amount of alcohol which is wanting.’—*Parl. Ec.* pp. 72, 73.

The same process goes on with gin. Dr. Normandy's evidence on this subject is as follows:—

'The articles used for adulterating gin are sub-carbonate of potash and alum; that is for fining. I have this information, I may say, in the handwriting of druggists themselves, and, in comparing the lists of the two parties, they were exactly similar. Alum can always be detected in gin. Oil of vitriol is also used, and oil of almonds; that is, for beading—in pouring the gin into a glass, it must form a series of little bubbles which hang on the periphery of the glass. Sulphuric acid can always be detected in gin. Then grains of paradise is used, which is a kind of pepper; it is a little reddish seed, about the size of small shot; it has a very peppery taste, and I understand it is used to replace the spirit, because the adulteration of gin is the dilution thereof. It is like beer; they use water, and then the object is to restore a portion of the taste and of the inebriating quality, for which they use *coccus indicus*.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 76.

But if the luxuries of mature life are thus tampered with, so also are those of childhood. Confectionaries of the cheaper sort, which are gaily adorned with bright colours, are, when analysed, found to be simple poison; and the only doubt with regard to the child who has consumed any of them is, whether the quantity of poison taken into the system is sufficient to cause death. This has been pretty well understood among the higher classes for a long time, and a careful mother would tremble indeed to see her child with but one morsel of the sweets that are daily prepared and daily exposed in hundreds of shops, in London and elsewhere. Dr. Hassall, it would seem, collected around him a kind of childish paradise of apparently delicious sweets; all the birds, beasts, and fishes, that surrounded Adam in the garden of Eden were also here present; nor was the apple of temptation forgotten, which, from its composition, cannot but strongly remind one of its great prototype, for its attractive colouring was found to consist of 'chromate of lead in really poisonous amount.' Among the various shapes in which these confectionaries were made up, we find a 'rasher of bacon;' 'mutton chop on plate,' coloured with artificial ultramarine and red organic pigment; oyster; fish, coloured with arsenite of copper and emerald green; strawberry, with chromate of lead; oranges, lemons, plums, potatoes, swans, pigeons, cocks, pheasants, dog and hare, crown, figure of dancers, &c. &c. The colouring matter is thus described:—

'It will be observed that the list of colouring matters above enumerated includes some substances of an injurious character, and many which are amongst the most virulent and deadly of the mineral poisons. Of those which may be considered as more or less injurious, are *Ferrocyanide of iron* or *Prussian blue*, *Antwerp blue*, Gamboge, and *German or artificial ultramarine*. Amongst those which are deadly and poisonous, are—the three chrome yellows or chromates of lead; red lead or red oxide of lead; white lead or carbonate of lead; vermilion or bisulphuret of mercury; the three Brunswick greens; verditer or carbonate of copper; and emerald green, Scheele's green, or arsenite of copper.

'It may be alleged by some that these substances are employed in quantities too inconsiderable to prove injurious; but this is certainly not so, for the quantity used, as is amply indicated in many cases by the eye alone, is often very large, and sufficient, as is proved by numberless recorded and continually occurring instances, to occasion disease, and even death; to some of these instances we shall hereafter refer.'—*Hassall*, p. 618.

It is said that French confectionaries, which far exceed our own in taste and beauty, are free from this poisonous colouring, the strictest attention being paid to the subject; but meanwhile, the children of our own country are being daily poisoned, and no one comes to their rescue. Dr. Letheby, in his evidence, says:—

'Every article of confectionary in this country is poisoned in this way. Continental confectionary never is so poisoned. There is no reason why people here should use inert pigments, for our confectioners do not approach foreign confectioners in reference to the appearance of their confectionary, and yet foreign confectionary does not contain any poisonous matter whatever.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 245.

One of the worst species of unwholesome adulteration, and one against which the voice of mankind ought to show peculiar indignation, is in the food supplied for the use of sailors. The recent *exposé* of preserved meats procured for the navy, when sealed canisters were found to hold the most abominable substances, was a most useful and at the same time painful warning that our sailors must go on eating salt pork and hard beef; not from any physical necessity of the case, but because the dishonesty of provision dealers entirely prohibits any extended adoption of a more scientific mode in the preservation of meat, such as would keep it fresh and agreeable to the taste, as well as free from the dangers of a salt diet. But even sea biscuits are not always to be depended on, as would appear from an instance mentioned by Dr. Letheby in his evidence:—

'An emigrant-vessel, about to start for Australia, had on board a quantity of *biscuit*. Fortunately, they gave some of it to the crew about a week before the vessel sailed; they found it disagreed with those who ate it; it produced extreme constipation. The biscuits were sent to me for examination, and I found no less than about thirty-one and a-half grains of chalk in an ounce-and-a-quarter of biscuit. It would assuredly have killed the whole of the crew if it had not been discovered before they got to sea.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 244.

If thus, however, we are called on, as a matter of public spirit, to feel indignation at this dark dishonesty practised on others, we may also be allowed, with regard to another class of adulteration, to protest with equal warmth against a still more hidden wickedness that is habitually practised to the injury of ourselves, and to the hindrance of that practical adaptation of science to the welfare of man, which is the characteristic of civilization. It is the concurrent testimony of several witnesses before the committee of the House of Commons, that drugs and medicines are very diffi-

cult to procure in a pure state, are systematically adulterated, and that medical men are very liable to be wholly disappointed in the remedies which they prescribe, in consequence of the patient not having his medicines good. Many articles of ordinary consumption may be examined and judged of to some extent by the public themselves, who are thus not wholly without protection, but in the use of drugs they are utterly defenceless against imposition. A sick man swallowing his potion is a fit emblem of blind confidence in the efficacy of what he drinks; he certainly is not prompted to imbibe by his natural appetite, he simply does so because he has trust in the after results it is expected to produce. It is thus the highest moral, as well as the most dangerous physical treachery, to tamper with the substance or strength of medicines, and should accordingly be looked on as a most heinous public offence.

Though several witnesses agree in stating that there is a very general adulteration of drugs, it is but fair to the trade, that Dr. Redwood's evidence to the contrary should have its weight. His object, however, seems chiefly intended to clear the retail druggists of any wilful system of dishonesty; and also, to prevent any great panic among invalids, who might hear exaggerated reports of the uncertainty of their medicines. We are much disposed ourselves to agree with his defence of chemists, when he says that they are a highly respectable body of men. As they are the best educated of retail tradesmen, so we believe them the most trustworthy; but still there are practices in the trade which ought clearly to be held dishonest; and though it may be said that the adulteration takes place with the wholesale druggists and drug-grinders, and that the retailers are themselves imposed upon, yet the public individually have a right to look to the man of whom the article is bought, and hold him responsible. It may be true, as Dr. Redwood observes, that retail chemists have done much to stop adulteration; and that 'all which has been done has been principally done through them,' but this is in itself a confession that adulteration exists. One cause of this adulteration, committing both wholesale and retail dealers, is thus described by this very witness:—

'The greatest amount of adulteration in drugs takes place probably at the mills where the drugs are powdered. Drugs generally do not admit of adulteration in their original state. The great majority of drugs are of vegetable origin, and in the state in which they are brought into this market they do not admit, generally speaking, of adulteration. When they are reduced to powder, the detection of the admixture of foreign matter becomes much more difficult, and it is drugs which have been submitted to such a process that are principally adulterated. That adulteration has taken place to a very great extent, but for many years chemists and druggists have set their faces against the practice, and much has been done

towards mitigating it. A practice existed in this country a few years ago, and up to the present time it exists to a certain extent, that the drug-grinder has to return to the wholesale druggist within four per cent. of the quantity of the drug which was sent to be ground; so that if a wholesale druggist sent 112lbs. of jalap to be powdered, he would expect to receive back 108lbs.; it was a conventionality between them.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 141.

Mr. Herring, a wholesale chemist and druggist, takes a far stronger line, and we extract the first paragraph of his evidence:—

'I am a wholesale chemist and druggist, and have been in business above forty years. During that time, and particularly for the last twenty years, I have had great experience in my own way of trade, and from what I have seen besides. Adulteration in the article of drugs exists to a very great extent; I will show you what is going on at the present day. Last week, or the week before, we had a sale of a most important article, *scammony*. It took place at Garraway's Coffee-house. Brokers are employed by merchants to sell these articles. Scammony comes principally from Aleppo, Smyrna, and those parts. It is one of the most important drugs we have. As an article of commerce, the scammony which we consider ought to be used will cost us 40s. a pound; but here is a piece which will show the Committee what is sold very often for that article. The true article is called virgin scammony, and I have been compelled to give 40s. a pound for it. The law allows anything to be imported, and that which I have before me was imported in the last month, and was sold at a public sale for 3s. a pound. It contains not one atom of scammony; not a trace of it. It is all gum and a mixture of various kinds; but still it is imported as scammony, paying no duty, and in it comes. There is a large demand for that spurious article, ten or twenty times as much as for the other. If it was not used, parties would not keep it; but it is used no doubt to a very great extent. To show the Committee how difficult it is to get a pure article, I may state that a great quantity comes with one-third and one-fourth adulteration; and I have lately examined four parcels of scammony, one of which was imported by ourselves, and the others by different merchants, and none of them contained any but a small portion of scammony. We ascertained that in one parcel, which was an exceedingly good one, out of 100 parts of the article there were seventy parts of scammony, twenty-four of insoluble matter, and six of water; that we call an excellent article. One had fifty-eight parts of scammony, thirty-six of insoluble matter, and six of water; and we descended at last to one containing sixty per cent. of scammony, insoluble matter thirty-six, and water four. We have some which is imported, not in this shape, which will contain from eighty to ninety per cent. of chalk. We analyse it, and get out the chalk and dirt, and see what scammony there is. This is one of the most important drugs we have, and still more so when you know that it enters into the compound extract which every medical man in ordinary practice is prescribing every day. When he is prescribing pills which are made from that compound article, he is doing more mischief than good, because, instead of acting as an aperient, it is acting quite as an astringent; a man is taking a quantity of chalk, and in many instances the bowels have been bound up, and it has been found to be occasioned by the medicine which has been taken.'—*Parl. Ev.* pp. 165, 166.

The evidence of Mr. Postgate is much to the same purport. The following passages occur in it:—

'I have lately found quinine very much adulterated with salicine, that is, an alkaloid obtained from the willow bark; it may have some effect upon

the system. I believe it is made in this country; a sample lately contained one-third. The price of salicine is 1s. 9d. an ounce; quinine, at present, I believe, is 9s.'

'Cod-liver oil I have found to be very much mixed up with other oils. This is difficult of detection.'

'In milk of sulphur I have found from 10 to 50 per cent. of sulphate of lime or plaster of Paris; this is extensively used in schools. I think the repeated use of sulphate of lime would be injurious. Plaster of Paris must be injurious in itself; it is perfectly innutritious and indigestible: it is like introducing into the system a quantity of clay.'

'Scammony I have found to be extensively adulterated with chalk and starch.'

'A quantity of white precipitate used for forming ointments came down from town adulterated to the extent of 65 per cent. with chalk and magnesia; the druggist was not aware of the adulteration, and had requested the manufacturer to send him a genuine article, inasmuch as his shop is one at which physicians' prescriptions are made up. He was not aware that the article was adulterated till I pointed it out to him. He paid the price of a genuine article.'—*Parl. Ev.* pp. 236, 237.

Those who endeavour to avoid the disagreeables of medicine by the use of capsules are liable to pay for the luxury rather dearly, as all who know the qualities of croton oil will acknowledge.

'I have here a sample of medicine prepared and sold in capsules; these are capsules containing, as it is said, concentrated *castor oil*, but really containing croton oil. I do not believe there is any castor oil at all. Croton oil is a medicine of a very violent purgative character; castor oil, on the contrary, is the mildest kind of purgative. I know a gentleman who was confined to his bed two days in consequence of having taken two of these capsules; one of these capsules contains ten drops of oil, and is stated to be equal to a teaspoonful of castor oil. Now castor oil cannot be concentrated, and therefore this is a gross deception upon the public.'—*Parl. Ev.* p. 238.

In other cases, the contents of capsules are wholly inoperative; and therefore a medical man, who allows his patient to use them, is liable to be surprised at a total want of success which will bring discredit on himself, and be dangerous to the patient.

There is other evidence of the same kind; and also the satisfactory assertion, that since the '*Lancet*' published its reports, many articles which used to be adulterated are no longer so. May we hope that the same improvement will go on, and that all chemists will be united in checking to their utmost all tampering with the public health.

It is not only, however, in those things which are destined for the interior of the human frame that we find much adulteration, the same vice and the same misfortune surround also our exterior. We not only eat rubbish and poison, but we are clothed with rottenness, and therefore too often with rags. This part of our system ought to be exposed as well as the other. Every article of dress is made up for sale, and not for use; a process of deceit runs through our whole manufacture of apparel,

and we can never be sure what it is we have on our backs. Every fabric that is sold, as made of one thing, generally consists in great part of another. Silks are mixed with cotton; a cloth that we may suppose came wholly from the wool of the sheep, really owes much of its substance to the same universal adulterator that comes from an American tree. This peculiarly applies to those goods which are made up for exportation, and English manufactures are now looked upon all through the world not only as showing a conspicuous want of taste, but as deteriorated in substance. Cloth, which has a very fair outside when perfectly new, soon becomes white at the seams and rotten in the wear; and ladies' dresses are so variously composed of silk, wool, and cotton, all mixed up together, that, for anything like strength or lasting qualities, the purchasers of them are wholly at the mercy of the makers, for they cannot pretend to have any knowledge, from examining the finished result, of the process by which it was made.

In this case, as in all other more elaborate articles of manufacture, the maxim '*Caveat emptor*' is an utter fallacy. As we have already shown, the arts of civilized life require for any degree of development that we should have confidence in each other. One man cannot understand everything; and many very useful persons, in their respective lines, are very incapable of estimating the quality of the necessary articles which they daily consume or wear. It is, therefore, a breach of that mutual confidence, on which alone any progress in civilization can be made, when trade and manufacture make dupes of the public, and deceive them in all the materials of life which they supply for their use. But it may be said that the public can remedy this themselves, and that if an article is found to be bad, the next purchase can be made at a different place, or another material tried. The public do, however, adopt this remedy, and yet find no benefit from it; for the system is universally prevalent, except in those shops where so extravagant a price is charged that adulteration is hardly worth the tradesman's while. It is the poor chiefly who suffer from deteriorated fabrics; every purchase with them is of the nature of an experiment. Each article, good or bad, must last till fashion in the making up of goods is so changed, that former experience is of no avail. In all classes, indeed, and with reference to all purchases, it is a curious reflection, as illustrating the 'changes and chances of this world,' how life itself is made up of experiments. One thing is tried, then another, and steady habits are scarcely to be found, except in the traditions of a former age.

There are persons, however, who hold such exaggerated and perverted notions of 'free-trade' that they claim for trade and manufac-

ture entire non-interference, leaving the public to protect themselves on the principles of competition. This argument we have already answered in considering the morality of the case, and the dependence of any developed civilization on the mutual feelings of honour existing among mankind. The question of free-trade, as we understand it, has nothing to do with such necessary enactments as have for their object the detection and punishment of deception. We do not at all understand why, because duty is not charged on any imported article, that no other precaution should be taken to prevent the sale of impure and adulterated goods. Let legislation be aimed direct at its object, and not be efficacious only by a side-wind. The object of the Excise and Customs is to obtain revenue, and it is only very imperfectly that machinery used for one purpose can also accomplish another. Yet an attempt is often made to mix up these two objects, and to cast the odium which attaches to Excise and Customs on any efforts to improve the sanatory condition of human food and drink. It so happens, indeed, that our only present mode of punishing the adulterators of exciseable articles is through the excise officers, on the ground that Government suffers a pecuniary loss; but if a more direct means could be adopted, if authorized inspection of food could be established for the protection of health, and to expose deception, we do not see why the question of free-trade need any longer be supposed at all to interfere with proper securities against fraud and imposition. Once separate the inquisitorial visits of the Excise from the sanatory question, and the latter stands on the simple and tangible ground of morality and public honesty. Free-trade, in the present order of worldly affairs, can mean no more than a mitigation of certain taxes and imposts. It has a definite and technical signification, and when the expression is used in any wider sense it becomes mere nonsense, and the wild cry of a few deluded persons, whose real notion is that every man may do that which is right in his own eyes, and be responsible to no one. If, under the pretext of free-trade, it is claimed to give up all interference with the manufacturers and sellers of adulterated articles, it follows immediately that the free-trade then meant is too theoretical for the world as it now exists, for it would leave men altogether free to commit any crime they liked. Men at present are not to be trusted to pursue virtuous lives on any abstract principles of political economy. We do not, indeed, as a general rule, punish vice when it only hurts the individual; but we still require protection on the part of the public against all such, be they murderers, thieves, or adulterating tradesmen, who, by their own violent, immoral, and dishonest practices, are injurious to their fellow-creatures.

We cannot agree with the Laureate in his very odd view that adulteration in food is a normal result of peace; or that the Russian war is likely to make tradesmen honest; but the lines from 'Maude,' rough in their homiletics as in their rhythm, are not to be forgotten:—

'Is it peace or war? Civil war, as I think, and that of a kind
Far viler, as underhand, not openly bearing the sword.
* * * *

'When the vitriol madness flushes up in the ruffian's head,
Till the filthy by-lane rings to the yell of the trampled wife,
While chalk and alum and plaster are sold to the poor for bread,
And the spirit of murder works in the very means of life.

'And men must lie down arm'd, for the villanous centre-bits
Grind on the watchful ear in the hush of the moonless nights,
While another is cheating the sick of a few last gasps, as he sits
To pestle a poison'd poison behind his crimson lights.'

ART. IV.—*The Prayer-book of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri.*
 London: The Oratory, King William Street.

IF there be one point of ecclesiastical order which would at first sight seem, more than any other, to be commanded by Holy Scripture, sanctioned by primitive usage, and required by common sense, it is surely this,—that the public offices of the Church should be offered in the vernacular language of the people. To employ, in addressing God, a tongue which His worshippers cannot comprehend; to wrap up Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels in the obscurity of a dead language,—can this be a reasonable service? Can this be a gospel preached to the poor? Can this be such a worshipping in spirit and in truth as our Saviour's express command enjoins? Is it not diametrically opposed to the declaration of S. Paul, 'Yet in the church I had rather speak ten words to the edifying of the hearers, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue?'¹ No man ever denied that the practice of the primitive Church was in accordance with this teaching, and that, *à priori*, one should have considered it a standing order, a stereotyped law, of the Church Catholic.

The more surprising, therefore, is it to find that all the branches of the Church, without one single exception, as well as heretical bodies, separated, indeed, from the Church, but still possessing ancient liturgies, have agreed in this: that the language of their public services shall be, to a certain extent,—some more, some less,—a language 'not understood of the people.' We do not, as we shall presently show, except entirely our own Church; and for the rest, from Kamschatka round the globe to Brazils, from Malabar and Gondar to Finland, the rule holds good. The apostolic law is, really or apparently, broken; and the 'ten thousand words' of Liturgies, and Hours, and Offices, are said in an unknown tongue.

Any man of common modesty,—any man with the remotest pretensions to philosophy,—any man, in short, except an orator at Exeter Hall,—would naturally exclaim, on becoming acquainted

¹ We remember a familiar explanation of this verse. A poor man who had just returned from a sermon of which it formed the staple, was asked the text. 'Well, Sir, I don't know the words to say them exactly; but it meant as how the parson would rather preach five minutes in English, than half-an-hour in French.'

with the fact, 'There must be some reason for this. Churches, separated as far by distance as by race and language,—Churches severed more widely still by polemical hatred,—never could coincide in so remarkable and unexpected an arrangement, were there not some strong cause which seemed to justify it. Good or bad, there must be a principle at work here; it cannot be a mere corruption.'

Let us see, in the first place, how the case actually lies; and then let us endeavour to discover its philosophy by investigating its history.

And, first, we will turn our eyes to the East. Here we see those most ancient and venerable Thrones of Alexandria, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, giving their laws to about sixteen millions of Christians. And those Liturgies which are said at the countless altars of Greece, the islands of the Archipelago, Bulgaria, Roumelia, the Principalities, Hungary, Croatia—or the Churches, now few and far between, of Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt—in what languages are they offered? For the most part, in two only—Greek and Slavonic. In Slavonic, for the Slavonian peoples of northern Turkey and the Principalities; in Greek, for the Greek himself, the Turk, the Syrian, and the Egyptian. Now, take the case in which the written language of the office-books, and the spoken dialect of the vulgar, bear the closest resemblance. Let any Greek scholar take up for the first time a Romaic book, and see how far he can always master even its general meaning. Then let him remember that he comes from the harder to the easier tongue,—that his necessary knowledge of comparative philology stands him in good stead; and next let him judge to what extent the Peloponnesian or Athenian peasant can comprehend the office-books of his own Church. And yet they have a far better chance than the Slavonic peoples. The three branches of the Illyrico-Servians,—Servians proper, Croatians, Vendes,—and, again, the Bulgarians and the Slovacks, cannot understand each other, much less can they comprehend the old Church Slavonic in which they pray. A remarkable proof of this occurred in the Panslavic Congress holden at Prague in 1848, where the deputies, in order to be intelligible to each other, were obliged to speak in the hated German; and their literary organ is conducted in that language. But more of this subject presently.

But three exceptions are to be found to this general rule. It is well known that the Wallachians employ a Romanæ language of the purest description; and that, in parts of that and adjoining provinces, Latin, perfectly intelligible to an English scholar, is actually at this day spoken. Towards the latter part of the eighteenth century, permission was given by the See of Constantinople for the employment of a vernacular Liturgy; a permission

not altogether, perhaps, independent, on the consideration that, possessing such an indulgence, the inhabitants would have less temptation to join the Latin Rite. Shortly afterwards, a Turkish form was authorized for some few villages in Asia Minor, where nothing else was understood; and an Arabic version is said to be used by the few orthodox who border on that country. These three exceptions are worth far more than their own intrinsic value, and we shall have occasion to refer to them again.

Casting our eyes over the map in a north-eastern direction, we come to the ever-orthodox Church of Georgia; a Church which resisted the artifices of Nestorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, produced countless martyrs under the invasions of Turks, Persians, and Tartars, and formed the nucleus of a mighty empire during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Here, again, the rule is the same: the Georgian of the Church books is entirely different from the Georgian that is now spoken; intelligible, perhaps, to the educated, but certainly not to the peasant.

Russia follows—and is the more worthy of our attention, because here the principle of a Church language, which is not the vernacular, is as boldly asserted as it is by Rome; its difficulties are allowed, are grappled with, and are, to a certain extent, overcome. Children are taught both languages from the commencement of their education; and the habit of acquiring Slavonic *pari passu* with Russ, may, perhaps, give the Russians their wonderful facility of mastering other languages. The difference between the two dialects is about the same,—in grammatical derivation, as between modern English and that of Chaucer; in form of character, between our present letter and Anglo-Saxon. Thus, while Russ has thirty-four characters, Slavonic possesses forty-three; the latter has a dual, the former has none; the former has borrowed many words of every-day occurrence from the Tartar, the latter has formed no such intermixture. And thus we have traversed the domains of the orthodox Eastern Church.

Nor are the separated communions less tenacious of the same use. In Egypt, the Jacobites employ the Coptic, which is nowhere intelligible, with the exception of one or two provincial terms; and the copies of the Liturgy in use have, therefore, an Arabic translation at the side. The scattered Nestorians and Jacobites of Asia Minor universally employ the dead language of Syriac. In Armenia, of all nations, the sacred and vernacular tongues are most identical.

Three hundred years ago, in opposition to the then prevailing practice, a national Church decreed as follows:—‘It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the practice of the ‘primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to

'minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.' Three centuries passed; and the office then compiled has become so obsolete in its phrases as certainly to fall not very far short of incurring the condemnation there pronounced. The fact is, that we are so thoroughly used to both our spoken language and to that of our Bible and Prayer-book, that we fail to see what foreigners remark at once, the world-wide difference between the two. Ordinary readers may never have observed some of those great grammatical variations which would strike a foreign philological scholar at first sight: the total absence, for example, in the older dialect of one of the most common possessive pronouns of the new—the word *its*: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and *his* righteousness.' 'These are they that came over Jordan . . . when it had overflowed all *his* banks.' 'The Tree of Life that—yielded *her* fruit every month.'—The utter confusion of that distinction between the verbs *will* and *shall*, on which we now so pique ourselves: 'Open thy mouth wide, and I shall fill it.' 'Them that are meek shall he guide in judgment; and such as are gentle, them shall he learn his way.'—The absence of that large class of participial adjectives which would seem to be, but are not, derived from a verb, such as *unwitnessed*, *unharnessed*; with one or two rare exceptions, like *unknown*. And if it be said that these differences are not such as to obscure the meaning to an ignorant person, it is equally true that there are others which must either make the sense unintelligible to him, or even reverse it. We have to explain, for instance, that when we pray, 'Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings,' we mean, 'Assist us;' that when we lament our being let in running the race that is set before us, we mean that we are *not* let to run it. And so we may fairly ask the question: Is it not almost impossible to find any one Collect which shall be intelligible to an uneducated person? Do not the inversions of the sentences, as well as the difficulty of the words, make it a matter of difficulty to explain these 'vernacular' prayers to the poor? Even in one of the Creeds, who is there among the lower classes that could comprehend such a phrase as 'of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting?' And how differently would it have been expressed had the service been composed in modern times! Nothing can be more clear than that the compilers of the Prayer-book did not use the easiest and readiest words. They had no idea of a simple Anglo-Saxon idiom. Far from wishing to express such a phrase as 'the impenetrability of matter,' by 'the unthoroughfarishness of stuff,' they purposely took the harder Latin word, to the exclusion of our own English synonym.—'And finally, after this life, may attain everlasting joy and *felicity*.' 'Where the souls of them that sleep in the

Lord enjoy perpetual rest and *felicity*,'—in the prayer for a sick child. The very title, *Solemnization of Matrimony*, is as good as a hundred proofs of this.

We are not blaming this,—far from it. We are merely showing that those who thought it their duty to exclaim most loudly against the employment of a foreign tongue in the services of the Church, themselves used a dialect of English different from any which is now, or which was ever, spoken; and 'not understood' entirely by any worshipper of the nineteenth century.

And now we will turn our attention to the successive developments of the Roman Church on this matter. Let us take a point where as yet the question of a vernacular service could not have assumed a practical form, and therefore, as the great men of that age were not given to philological theorizing, where it could not have taken any tangible form at all. Let us imagine how S. Gregory the Great must have regarded such a difficulty. Looking around him from the Eternal City, he saw, within his own Patriarchate, a people, as yet, almost homogeneous: in Spain, in Gaul, in Italy, in Sicily, in Africa, multitudes of Liturgies, but as yet, in different degrees of corruption, only one language. That this language was becoming so changed as to seem scarcely like itself, was a fact which we can hardly imagine to have struck, even if it were barely known to, the authorities of the Church. The Gallican Liturgies, such as we now have them, may use the ablative for the accusative, may employ terms, may familiarize idioms unknown at Rome; but the Roman Church ignored such varieties of Liturgies, owning the one faith, the one Creed, and the one Western language. At a later period, when some ignorant priest had baptized *In nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sanctua*, we find the successor of S. Peter maintaining the validity of such a rite; and no one, from that time to this, has questioned the truth of such a decision.

It was when the Roman Church was brought into contact with the Teutonic or Celtic races, that the question of a vernacular language must first have presented itself as a difficulty to be solved. It is not our intention to enter on the subject of vernacular translations of Holy Scripture; this would swell the remarks we shall have to offer beyond all due limits. The version made by Ulphilas into Mæso-Gothic, between the years 360 and 380, must be considered as the first great attempt to grapple with the difficulties of a barbarous language; and though the Bishop himself was a Cappadocian, and, of course, introduced Eastern rites among his flock, yet the influence of such an undertaking must have been prodigious in the Western world. Whether he in like manner translated the Liturgy is a question which

cannot be answered; there is no trace of any such version, and the fact that the Eastern rite so soon died out among the Goths seems an argument that it never existed. There is no doubt that the mass maintained itself in Latin; there is equally no doubt that, in the next centuries, a part of the daily offices were said in the dialect of the country, and many curious documents remain as standing witnesses of the fact. Versions of Psalms and Canticles abound, almost coeval with the introduction of Christianity into Germany. The *Te Deum*, for example, received a version in the eighth or ninth century, which has been more than once reprinted, and which commences—

Thih Cot lopêmes,
Thih truhtnan gehernes :
Thih ewigan Fater
Eokiwelih erda wirdit.

So, again, a version of the Psalms existed in Dutch as early as the time of Charlemagne. One of the Epistles and Gospels was made in the eighth century, in what is now the Duchy of Brunswick; the monks of Fulda, in the same age, translated the like parts of the Liturgy. Then there is the so-called Wessobrunni Prayer, which speaks to the same thing at the same date in Bavaria. S. Notker Balbulus, the inventor of Sequences, who died in 912, made a High German version of the Psalms, clearly and manifestly for the benefit of those who were constantly hearing them in church, and interlined with a short commentary, in this manner:—

'*Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum.*
'*Der man is salig, der in dero argon rat na gegiang.* As Adam did, when he followed the advice of his wife in opposition to God.
'*Et in viâ peccatorum non stetit.*
'*Noh an dero sundigon wege ne stuont.* So he did. He went thither; he went to the broad way that leadeth to hell, and stood there, for he gave way to his lust.'

So, again, in the same centuries, there was a Theotisc¹ translation of the most popular of Latin hymns; it is both accurate and spirited, and was no doubt used in public worship. A still more remarkable example of the same thing is to be found in the 'Evangelical Harmony of Otfrid,' a work of the latter half of the ninth century.² These are hymns of considerable length, on such subjects as the Mission of the Angel to S. Mary, the Magnificat, the presentation of our Lord in the temple, His Baptism, the opening of the first chapter of S. John, &c. Here is the shortest of them, the mere versification of a Collect:—

¹ It has been published by the celebrated philologist Grimm, under the title of 'Hymnorum veteris Ecclesie xxvi. versio Theotisca.' Göttingen, 1830.

² Published by E. G. Graff, Königsberg, 1831.

'Got, thir eigenhaf ist
thaz io genâthih bist
intfaâ geba unsar,
thes bethurfun wir sâr
Thaz uns, thiô ketinun
bindent therô sundûn
thinerô mildô
genad intbinde baldo.'

'O God, Whose nature and property
is ever to have mercy and to forgive,
receive our humble petitions; and
though we be tied and bound with the
chain of our sins, let the pitifulness
of Thy great mercy loose us.'

The Council of Leptines, in 744, expressly orders that the renunciation and profession of faith in Baptism be made in the vernacular, and proposes this Theotisc formula for the latter: '*Gelobistu in Got almechtigan Fadaer? Ec gelobo in Got almechtigan Fadaer. Gelobistu in Christ, Godes Suno? Ec gelobo in Christ, Godes Suno. Gelobistu in Halogan Gast? Ec gelobo in Halogan Gast.*' And S. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, had before this especially insisted on the same point. '*Nullus sit Presbyter, qui in ipsâ linguâ quâ nati sunt baptizandos abrenuntiationes et confessiones audire et interrogare non studeat, ut intelligent quibus renuncient, vel quæ confitentur.*' But, curiously enough, the opposite practice seems to have become prevalent again; for, in the middle of the ninth century, we find S. Hrabanus Maurus insisting that the priests of his province should preach in Theotisc; whence one can only conclude that they were in the habit of delivering their discourses in Latin. It is certain also that from a very early period, perhaps as early as this, part of the Office for the Dedication of Churches and Churchyards was in the vernacular language, as also was much of that for the Visitation of the Sick.

But this one great fact remains unquestioned: that, till the latter part of the ninth century, Rome never conceded—perhaps had never been asked to concede—the use of a vernacular Liturgy. That the Epistles and Gospels were often read in the patois which the people happened to speak, is conceded; that the *Gloria in excelsis*, and other hymns of a similar kind, had also been translated, is equally certain; but the mass itself was said in Latin, and in Latin only. It is true that, in some Gallican and Mozarabic masses, the Latin is so corrupted as almost to amount to another language; but still the principle was maintained. Let us see what that principle was.

Up to this period Rome had won to herself only the Romance peoples: the first to acknowledge her, the last to remain faithful to her; and here for centuries Latin remained the spoken tongue, dying off so gradually and imperceptibly into French, Spanish, or Portuguese, that the change was hardly noticed; and the uneducated went on praying in the tongue in which their fathers and grandfathers had prayed, without knowing that every year was widening the gulf between that which they heard, and that which they spoke. At length the Patriarchal Throne

of the West was brought into contact with the fierce, young activity of Germanic life,—with tongues that, to the soft ears of the South, must have presented the most barbarous dissonances—languages without grammar, with unsettled inflexions, differing widely from each other, each intelligible in its own little plot of country only. There was not material as yet, there was not stability, to endure a translation of the fixed and immutable Liturgy. Dialects were altering so fast, that a translation would soon have itself needed an interpretation. Then half the words must necessarily have been mere Latin or Greek obtrusions into the language. Baptism, Church, Resurrection, Communion, Incarnation—how could those barbarous races have expressed them, but by themselves? Add, again, the necessary irreverence that must attend the transfusion of such solemn mysteries into tongues incapable, as yet, of grammar. Add, also, the difficulties regarding particular words, such as that which lately occurred in a version of the Scriptures for, we believe, some of the islands of the Indian Ocean; where the word *lamb* is used in the sense in which we employ *ass*, and it was therefore impossible to translate the Scriptural name of our Lord but by a paraphrase. No doubt these, and such as these, were wise reasons for the non-adoption of the vernacular; and others have been well stated by a late writer:—

‘But when the nations and kingdoms of modern Europe were at length formed, and their languages fixed, the disturbing influences of their separate nationalities became so strong that they could hardly be kept together in ecclesiastical unity, even though they had all one and the same faith, Church Law, and Ritual, and one common clergy, with a language of its own, interpenetrating them all, and concentrated in one common independent centre at Rome. Under such circumstances, any change which should tend to strengthen still further the separate nationalities, and to divide and nationalize that common clergy, which, like the citizens of old Rome, being mixed everywhere with the provincials, bound the whole into unity, would be manifestly most dangerous; and exactly the same reasons which would move an heresiarch or a tyrant who wished to try with impunity to introduce the use of the vulgar tongue for the purposes of religion, to abolish the celibacy of the clergy, and to banish monks and friars, would weigh with bishops and popes to make them oppose or forbid such changes.’

But it is now time to turn to the two great struggles which Rome carried on in defence of this principle, in both of which she conceded it, and in both with only partial success. And let us first fix our eyes on the mission of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

It was while Constantinople was alternately disgusted by the buffooneries, and horror-struck at the ferocity, of the Emperor

Michael III., that a deputation arrived from the Prince of the Khazares, to solicit instruction in Christianity. His kingdom stretched from the Caspian to Wallachia and Moldavia; it had passed the zenith of its greatness, and many of the Slavic tribes that had been his tributaries, were beginning to throw off the yoke of the Hunno-Tartar. By the advice of the Patriarch S. Ignatius, Constantine (better known by his last name of Cyril), a native of Thessalonica, was appointed to the mission; and after having been raised to the priesthood, he spent some time in Kherson, where he mastered the Khazaric language. He was so far successful as to convert and baptize the Khan, whose example was followed by a large portion of his people; and the missionary had his attention next directed to the neighbouring Bulgarians. He found them using a language of inexhaustible richness and beauty, abounding with inflexions, capable of expressing various shades of meaning with a felicity peculiar to itself—the rival of Greek in flexibility, its superior in copiousness: he found a people desirous of receiving the true faith, and he became the parent of their literature, as well as their apostle. He first had to invent an alphabet, and this he did with great skill and judgment. He adopted the Greek characters so far as they went; but its twenty-two literal forms went but a little way in supplying the forty-three which he found to be necessary to his system. He therefore varied some of these, where he saw an analogy between the old sound and the new. For example: the sound B was unknown to ancient Greek, (it is expressed in Romaic by $\mu\pi$;) and that symbol represents V. But it existed in Bulgarian, and therefore Constantine expressed it by docking a part of the upper loop. Some of his characters he derived from the Hebrew, and some few he invented for himself; and thus he produced the Slavonic or Cyrillic alphabet—the sacred language to this day of all the Slavonians of the Eastern Church. He is said to have perfected his work on his return to Constantinople, and there to have commenced his translation of the Scriptures with the assistance of his brother, Methodius, who associated himself in the labour. A few years later, Rostislaff, Prince of Moravia (then one of the Slavonic peoples), sent an embassy, requesting that Constantine might be despatched to them, not only to confirm them in the faith which they had already received from the Western Church, but ‘to teach them to read,’—that is, to introduce his new alphabet. The two brothers accordingly set forth, and were received with the greatest joy.

Nicolas I., one of the ablest and most enterprising among the Popes, at this time filled the chair of S. Peter. Hearing of the success of the new missionaries, he requested their presence at Rome, where, however, they did not arrive till

after the consecration of his successor, Hadrian II. By that Pontiff they were raised to the episcopal dignity; and shortly afterwards, Constantine, having changed his name to Cyril, departed this life. Methodius returned the same year, A. D. 868, into Moravia, and occupied himself in preaching the Gospel there and in Pannonia.

It is not wonderful that the people, who had before been accustomed to the Latin Rite, were delighted at hearing the Liturgy in their own language, and deserted the Western missionaries for the new comers. It is also not wonderful that the former, chagrined at the turn of affairs, appealed to Rome, denouncing Methodius as a heretic, and his Liturgy as impious and profane.

'We are informed,' writes Pope John VIII. to that prelate, 'that you sing mass in the Slavonic tongue. We have already forbidden this, in the letters sent by Paul, Bishop of Ancona; and we enjoin that you celebrate mass in Latin or in Greek, as is the use of the Church in all the countries of the world; but you can preach to the people in their own language.'

At the same time, he requires Methodius to present himself at Rome.

Here therefore, for the first time, we find Rome brought into collision with a vernacular rite. But the missionary had great advantages on his side. The talents and learning of Photius had made him a most formidable rival to the papal chair; the two Churches had entered on their terrible and fatal struggle; Moravia, and Pannonia, and Bulgaria were the border lands; and it was necessary either to conciliate their peoples, or a rival might offer more advantageous terms. To Rome Methodius came, and there satisfied the Pope as to his orthodoxy, and also as to his use of the vernacular.

'We approve,' writes John VIII. to Sviatopolk, Prince of Moravia, 'of the Slavonic letters invented by Constantine the Philosopher, and we will that the doings and the praises of JESUS CHRIST be published in that tongue, because S. Paul teaches that every tongue ought to confess that Christ is LORD, to the glory of God the Father. For it is not contrary to the faith that the same Slavonic tongue should be employed in celebrating mass, in reading the Gospel, or the other Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments well translated, and in chanting the other offices of the Hours. He Who has made the three principal languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, has made also all others to His glory. We will, however, that, to the end more reverence be paid to the Gospel, it be read first in Latin, and then in Slavonic, for the sake of those who do not understand Latin, as the practice is in some churches. And if you and your principal men prefer to hear the mass in Latin, we will that it be sung to you in Latin.'

The letter is of June, 880.

On this Methodius returned to his labours; but the opposition to the vernacular service was not entirely at an end. The Pope, however, stood firm, and the success of the energetic missionary proved the wisdom of the permission. Bohemia had

already been, to some small extent, evangelized, but had almost relapsed into idolatry. Carrying his Liturgy and his translation with him, Methodius advanced into that land, and, in 894, converted the Duke Borzivog, and his wife S. Ludmilla,—the latter afterwards the protomartyr of her country. But the nation again relapsed into Paganism, and its final emersion from darkness was owing to missionaries of the Latin Church. These indefatigably put down the Slavic Liturgy wherever they found it, both in Moravia, Pannonia, and Bohemia; and the latter people, afterwards to exercise such an important influence on the question, were at first scarcely even familiarized, as their neighbours had been, to a vernacular rite.

We pass over nearly two hundred years: and it is worth while to give a glance at the altered circumstances of these border lands. The two Churches were now irreconcilably separated. Bulgaria, so long the object of their contention, had attached itself to the Oriental faith, and maintained with all its might the Eastern Liturgy in the Cyrillic version and with the Cyrillic characters. Not the province that it is now, but a vast kingdom, it stretched from the Save to the Gulf of Lepanto, embracing Servia, Albania, and parts of Roumelia, and teeming with all the young life of that second spring in the Byzantine Church. To the north lay the vast province of Strigonium, in the Latin obedience, comprehending Hungary and Transylvania; comprising on its north the provinces of Gnesne, which embraced Poland; on its north-west that of Mayence, which contained a part of Bohemia and Moravia; and on its west that of Salzburg, in which lay the rest of these two countries. In all these, the vernacular Liturgy was nearly at an end. Bohemia alone still struggled for it. The Archbishop of Magdeburg had insisted, in 977, on a Latin Liturgy: a deputation, headed by two of the nobility, Bolchosi and Myslibor, went to Rome, and obtained permission from Benedict VIII. to use the vernacular rite, a privilege which they maintained precariously for nearly a century. But in the province of Dioclea, in Bosnia, Croatia, and Dalmatia, it still strove for the preeminence. The Eastern rite was given up; but the Latin Mass was said in Slavonic, and with Cyrillic letters. Rome had been unceasingly on the watch to withdraw the privilege accorded to Methodius, and the history of Spalato records a series of attempts, sometimes on the part of the Metropolitan, sometimes on the part of the Pope. In the obscure Dalmatian annals of the commencement of the tenth century, we meet with the name of one prelate, who was clearly a man with wisdom beyond his age,—Gregory of Nona.¹ In the

¹ It would seem that the see of Nona had some such metropolitanical pretensions over Croatia. How far a rivalry on this point with Spalato might have embittered the other dispute, it is now impossible to say.

Council of Spalato, held about 910, he alone stood up for the vernacular rite, and, undeterred by the threats of his brethren, he refused to pay obedience to the canon of the synod which proscribed it. The matter went by appeal to John X., the most execrable wretch (if we except Alexander VI.) who ever wore the tiara—the infamous lover of the more infamous Theodora. The stupid letter in which he confirms the Council is given at length by Farlati: it makes, however, this exception,—that where a district is ill supplied with priests, if one of them is unacquainted with any tongue but Slavonic, he may apply to Rome for a dispensation, and continue to employ it. The people, notwithstanding, were not to be coerced into the change: the Slavonic Liturgy remained in use, till in 1058 another Council was held against it. The proscription was now more rigorous than ever, and the Croats actually rose in rebellion, headed by one Ulf. This personage, however, was no honour to the cause: he went to Rome, came back with a sham bishop, whom he intruded into the see of Vegla, and kept up the imposition for some years. When it was discovered, the perpetrators suffered according to their deserts; but it was by this time that an attempt to eradicate the national rite was hopeless. At another Council of Spalato, in 1064, the matter seems to have been, to a certain extent, compromised. ‘A great part of the inhabitants of Illyria,’ says that clever writer, who assumes the name of Talvi, ‘remained, nevertheless, faithful to their language, and to a worship familiar to their minds through their language. A singular means, Dobrovsky asserts, was found by some of the shrewder priests to reconcile their inclinations. A new alphabet was invented, or rather the Cyrillic letters were altered and transformed in such a way, as to approach in a certain measure to the Coptic characters. To give some authority to the new invention, it was ascribed to S. Jerome. This, it was maintained, is the Glagolitic alphabet so called, used by the Slavic priests of Dalmatia and Croatia until the present time. Cyril’s translation of the Bible and Liturgic books were copied in these characters with a very few deviations in the language, which probably had their foundation in the difference of the Dalmatian dialect, or were the result of the progress of time; for this event took place at least 360 years after the invention of the Cyrillic alphabet. With this modification, the priests succeeded in satisfying both the people and the chair of Rome. It sounded the same to the people, and looked different to the Pope. The people submitted easily to the ceremonies of the Romish worship if only their beloved language was preserved; and the Pope, fearing justly the translation of the whole Slavic population of those provinces to the Greek Church, permitted the mass to be read in Slavonic in order to preserve his influence in general.’

It has since, however, been demonstrated that the Glagolitic alphabet—the rudest, coarsest, and clumsiest of European symbols—is of a much earlier date, and that probably the indigenous priests reintroduced it for the purposes above mentioned. After this, the opposition to the national rite ceased in a great measure. The ninth canon of the fourth Lateran Council, where Bernard, Metropolitan of Spalato, was present, decrees that, in case of different rites or language, the Bishop shall provide, *sacerdotes qui secundum varietatem rituum et linguarum divina officia celebrent*; and may even, under the same circumstances, appoint a Vicar-Bishop. This canon was understood to bear especial reference to Illyria.

By degrees, however, Rome obtained one great object of her desires,—the adoption of Latin letters in the Illyrian mass. We shall see, presently, that the Cyrillic character was always excessively obnoxious to Ultramontanes; and that, at whatever expense of philology, the Roman alphabet was introduced wherever circumstances permitted. The then existing version was corrected by Raphael Levacovich, under Urban VIII., both in the Breviary and Missal: this was not well done, and gave rise to some discontent. The ritual was translated by Bartholomew Carsio. These versions were again corrected by Cavanamus, Bishop of Jadera, a thorough Slavonic scholar, and appeared in 1741; his edition is a good one, but we have been told that the language is rather too fine.

There are, therefore, in these provinces three distinct rites of the Roman use: the Roman rite, with the Latin language; the Roman rite, with the Slavonic language; and the Eastern rite (Uniat), with the Slavonic. The way in which these Uniat are (or at least were, till the end of the last century) supplied with priests, is remarkable. The Uniat insist on having their clergy ordained according to the Greek rite. This, notwithstanding many applications to Rome, the Bishops of the Uniat communion have never been allowed to use. Application is therefore made to the prelates of the Eastern Church: the priest is ordained by them; is thus made to renounce “schism,” and so instituted to the pastoral office.

It may not be amiss, before we quit these remarkable nations, to give the reader some idea of their numbers, and of their respective attachment to the two Churches. Putting Russia aside, the Eastern Slavonians are divided into the Illyrico-Servian and Bulgarian branches; the Western, into Czekho-Slovakians, Poles, Suabian Vendes, and Tchacones. The numbers stand about thus:—

| | Total Number. | Eastern Church. | Western Church. |
|--|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Illyrico-Servians : | | | |
| 1. Servians (in Servia) | 1,100,000 | 1,000,000 | 100,000 |
| 2. Servians (in Hungary) ... | 400,000 | 300,000 | 100,000 |
| 3. Bosnians (many are Mahometans). | 500,000 | 300,000 | 80,000 |
| 4. Tchernogortzi, or Montenegrins. | 60,000 | 60,000 | — |
| 5. Slavonians (Kingdom of Slavonia and Duchy of Syrmia.) | 500,000 | 200,000 | 300,000 |
| 6. Dalmatians | 500,000 | 80,000 | 420,000 |
| 7. Croatians..... | 800,000 | 200,000 | 600,000 |
| 8. Slovenzi, or Vendes (in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola). | 1,100,000 | — | 1,000,000 the rest Protestants. |
| Bulgarians : | | | |
| 1. Bulgarians proper | 3,500,000 | 3,200,000 | 300,000 |
| 2. Bulgarians in Bessarabia. | 80,000 | 80,000 | — |
| Czekho-Slovakians : | | | |
| 1. Bohemians & Moravians | 4,500,000 | — | 4,400,000 |
| 2. Slovaks (principally in North Hungary). | 2,400,000 | 500,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Poles : | | | |
| (Russian Polish provinces, Galicia and Lodomeria). | 10,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 7,500,000 |
| Suabian Vendes : | | | |
| (Lusatia, and some part of Brunswick, now Germanised). | 2,000,000 | — | 1,000,000 |
| Tchacones : | | | |
| (Eastern part of Peloponnesus, say) | 20,000 | 20,000 | — |
| | 27,460,000 | 7,940,000 | 16,800,000 |

Of course, when we add the 38,000,000 of Russians proper, and the 13,000,000 of Russniaks, who belong to the Eastern Church, we quite reverse the proportion. But the dependence of these eighteen or nineteen millions on the Roman Church is owing, in great measure, to the use of their vernacular language in eucharistic offices. Let us now look at the remarkable struggle in Bohemia on this subject.

We have seen that in A.D. 977 the Bohemians arrested from the Court of Rome the use of the vernacular language in their Liturgies. This privilege was again taken from them in the pontificate of S. Gregory VII., though the resolute spirit of that people still maintained the Slavonic Ritual as they best could, in spite of the decrees of councils and of popes. Towards the

end of the fourteenth century, the cry for a vernacular service became loud throughout Bohemia. Mixing itself also with the demand for the free accordance of the chalice to the laity, it found a mouth-piece in John Huss and Hieronymus von Faulfisch, better known as Jerome of Prague. Those to whom the fate of Huss is as a household word, may not be so generally aware that he was the settler of Bohemian orthography, and the framer of its language as it now exists. Bohemian is the most copious and the most exact of the Slavonic tongues, and its forty-two letters received their ultimate name and disposition from Huss. Whatever were his errors, and whatever absurdities may have been promulgated regarding the violation of his safe-conduct by the Council of Constance—which safe-conduct never existed, and therefore could never have been violated—Huss is thus to be honourably distinguished, when compared with Jerome of Prague, a man of but doubtful morality, violent, self-willed, and insincere. If his fate be remembered, it must also be remembered that he himself had ordered the murder of a monk who opposed one of his services. Then came the split between the so-called reformers in Bohemia; the Calixtines or Utraquists contenting themselves with the demand for the permission of the chalice, and of a vernacular service; the Taborites, and their various schisms, being heretics of the worst description, and ready to repeat the enormities of their ferocious leader, Ziska.

The Council of Basle, that standing protest against Ultramon-
tanes, and equally abhorred and feared by members of that faction, proved its wisdom and moderation by admitting the delegates of the Bohemians to a free and open conference. We may smile when we read of the tedious manner in which deputies spoke, and members of the Council answered—of the three days the famous Calixtine Rokitsana consumed in proving the advantage of communion in both kinds, and the length which John de Prague required for his reply. But it is never to be forgotten that the decree of the Council which succeeded these disputations, was the means of preserving a whole nation in the unity of the Church.

'As to the Communion in both kinds, the intention of the Council is not to tolerate it as an evil connived at on account of the baseness of heart of those that demand it, but as one useful and salutary to them that receive this Sacrament worthily. The Council will examine the question more thoroughly; but the priests, who give the Communion in both kinds, are to teach that JESUS CHRIST is received whole and entire in each.'

With this, the question of the vernacular service was also mixed up, and that concession united the Calixtines with the Roman Church, and crushed the Taborites; yet Bohemia eagerly accepted the Reformation, and when it elected Frederick

the Elector Palatine, the imbecile son-in-law of James I., as its king, three-fourths of its inhabitants had embraced different kinds of heresy. The battle of the White Mountain, in 1620, settled the religious as well as the political state of the country. The Catholic Church was triumphant, and Bohemia may contest with the Tyrol and Brittany the honour of being the most Catholic country in Europe. But the great result still remained; and that Slavonic people retained their vernacular Liturgy.

The writer well remembers how, having arrived late in that glorious city of Prague on a Saturday night, and standing early next morning on the bridge—the scene of the martyrdom of S. John Nepomucene—the masses of worshippers pouring to their various churches, seemed to him more striking than anything of the kind he had ever witnessed in any other Catholic city: how the long street on the one side that leads up to the Cathedral and the Strahoff monastery, on the heights where the Hradschin stands, was one stream of heads; while, on the other, the main arterial street that goes to the Theinkirche, was equally crammed. Add to all, the clamour of countless bells, and the contrast of the gentle Moldau, with the life and animation of both its banks, all lit up by a bright spring sun, and the writer's first acquaintance with a vernacular Roman service was made under very pleasurable circumstances. It seemed strange, in the Theinkirche, to see the well-known postures, and to hear the familiar chants, accompanied with Slavonic *formulae*—the *Hospodine pomiluy*, for example, instead of the *Kyrie eleison*. One concluding remark on Bohemia may not be out of place.

It was the fashion, some ten years ago, among Anglo-Romanists, to prophesy the speedy conversion of England. The droppings from our ranks they took to be the forerunners of the whole host, and must have been bitterly disappointed that the few went and came, and made but little real difference on the one side or the other. Their own ill-success, despite so much zeal, so much energy, so much munificence, seemed a startling fact. Theories are not difficult to make; and the latest seems to be this, that where a country, *as* a country, has apostatized from the faith, *as* a country there is no regeneration for it; that the utmost the Church can hope to effect, is to snatch individuals from the mass of heresy or unbelief; and that this is the object to which she is to lend her aim, and the goal with the attainment of which she is to remain content—a most unsatisfactory thing, if it could be proved, but contrary to all the teaching of ecclesiastical history. Witness this very country of Bohemia, which, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, had almost totally apostatized to Lutheranism or Calvinism, but which was, humanly speaking,

by that one battle of the White Mountain, brought back to the Church.

We will now turn our eyes to another remarkable instance in which a national rite and a vernacular language has been allowed: we mean the Greek Liturgy of Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia.

And here again we are brought into that mournful portion of ecclesiastical history, the struggle between the Eastern and Western Churches. One is apt to forget, how weak, in the ninth and tenth centuries, was the actual authority possessed by the Roman Pontiffs; how Constantinople had invaded even their stronghold, Italy, elbowing them from Calabria and Apulia; while Sicily, under the temporal dominion of the Saracens, regarded the Œcumenical Patriarch as its spiritual head. In fact, the East gained further and further in this direction on the West, and at one period threatened to exclude the papal authority from the whole of South Italy; nor was it till the Normans, devoted to the interests of the Holy See, spread themselves over that country, that Rome succeeded in this quarter in her struggle with Constantinople. But though the Eastern Church was here driven out, the Eastern Liturgies remained behind, and they found a greater protection from the See of Rome than from their Norman conquerors, who abhorred them.¹ At Naples, especially, the Christians of both rites lived² in the greatest concord and amity; the Latins using the Latin, the Greeks the Greek, Liturgy. The Collegiate Church of S. Januarius, for instance, had, in 1300, a mixed chapter of Latins and Greeks. How the choir could, ecclesiologically, have been filled for the two rites, it is not easy to understand. So in the Chronicle of S. Maria de Piombino, which is supposed to have been written in the thirteenth century, it is mentioned that, on Easter-eve, the six *Primicerii* of the six Greek churches were under obligation to assist at the Latin office, and to sing six lessons in Greek, and at Easter other dignitaries of the same churches were in like manner to say the Creed in their native language. The Church of S. Maria del Poggio, in the district of Revello, petitioned Pius V. in 1572, to be allowed to pass from the Greek to the Latin rite. The Pope assented. The Chapter then altered its mind, and resolved to retain the Liturgy of its predecessors. But Spinelli, the bishop, obliged them to avail themselves

¹ 'L'origine del rito Greco nelle Provincie che compongono i due Reami di Napoli, e di Sicilia per mezzo degli Orientali nel secolo ottavo, e la sua decadenza procurata con maravigliosa destrezza dai Principi Normanni nell' undecimo, sono i due poli tra si opposti, ai quali l'argomento di questo primo libro dovrà internamente aggorarsi.' So says Rodotà, at the commencement of his history.

² So Petrus Subdiaconus, in his life of S. Athanasius of Naples, where he is speaking of the interment of that prelate, '*Confluebant uterque sexus et ætas diversa, et qualiter poterant, psalmodiæ Græce et Latine suavi modulatione resonabant.*'

of the dispensation for which they had asked. In Brundisium the Greek rite was given up in 1173, but a trace of it still remains, or did remain, in the last century. On Palm Sunday, a solemn procession took place from the cathedral to the church called *Hosanna*, in which the Epistle and Gospel were sung with extraordinary solemnity in Greek. It appears that in 1609 the Archbishop, Dionysio Odriscol, one of those persons who were for squaring everything to the exactest dimensions of the Latin rite, resolved to put an end to these ancient customs. The Chapter strenuously opposed him, and, on his persisting in his mandate, appealed to Rome. The case was heard, and judgment given against the Archbishop, to his extreme chagrin. In a Diocesan Synod holden at Otranto, about the year 1580, no fewer than two hundred priests of the Greek rite were present. It seems that in some places, as at Galatena, the Greek priests had a reputation for piety so far exceeding that of the other rite, that the Latin population flocked to them, although unacquainted with their idiom. Where every thing else has disappeared, the name of the church will sometimes tell of the great prevalence of the Greek rite there: thus the Cathedral of Bova is called S. Maria dell' *Isodia*, and another church in the same city, the *Theotocos*. The Cathedral of Rossano was entirely Greek till 1461, when the Archbishop, Matteo Saraceni, introduced the Latin rite by force, and caused the exploit to be recorded on his tomb:—

'Hanc, quam cernis, ille, cujus laus est perennis
Transtulit in Latinum, ecclesiam, de Græco ad cultum divinum,
Cui nomen est Matthæus, quem in Præsulem degit æternus Deus.
Ordinis fuit minorum, qui in numero fuit magnus Prædicatorum.'

So again, in some places, as in the famous Church of S. Maria del Grafeo, otherwise called *La Catholica*, in Messina, the language was Greek, but the vestments were Latin, and azymes were employed.

The Greek rite in Italy received considerable augmentation by the immigration of a large body of Albanians when their country fell under the dominion of the Turks. They were especially protected by Leo X. and Paul III., notwithstanding the various and repeated attacks of Latin Bishops. This, among other causes, gave rise to the establishment of the Greek College in Rome, by Gregory XIII., in 1577. And for the same reason Clement VIII., in 1695, instituted a Greek Bishop in the Church of S. Athanasius at Rome, to confer holy orders on those of that nation. The Basilians, too, would form an interesting illustration of our subject, did time permit us to enter on that part of it. When Rodotà wrote, in 1760, there were three houses of these monks in the States of the Church, eighteen in Neapolitan Italy, and twenty-three in Sicily.

The pleasing character of the union between Greeks and Latins in Italy, forms a mournful contrast with the Unia in Russia and Poland, to which we must now direct our thoughts.

At the time when Sigismund III. was seated on the Polish throne, his territory, be it remembered, extending over a great part of White Russia, wrested from that power by the Poles, an attempt of a novel nature was made to bring over a portion of the Eastern Church to the Roman Communion. The king himself had long been employing the usual methods of semi-persecution: the nobles who held to the faith of their forefathers were in every way discouraged: the churches were given to the Latins, and the orthodox were forbidden to erect new ones: a large emigration took place into Great Russia, and those who remained were of course the more dispirited and weakened. There was one Cyril Terletsky, Bishop of Ostrog, a man of bad character, who, angry at some reproof that his misdeeds had brought down on him, and wishing to better his position, determined to join the Roman Church, and offered his services to the King, to induce others to imitate his example. The Metropolitan of Kieff, Michael Ragosa, a timid man, was much under the influence of Cyril; and secret offers were made by Rome, which induced him to enlist in her cause. The rites were to be entirely unchanged; the *Filioque* was not even to be added to the Creed; the United Greek Church was to be perfectly free from the control of the Latin Bishops, and its members were not to be allowed to embrace the Latin Rite. All the privileges and prerogatives of the prelates were to remain; and Clement VIII. engaged to procure for them a seat in the National Diet.

A Synod met at Brzesc, in Lithuania, and the point at issue was warmly disputed. Several of the prelates stood firm; but seven resolved on giving in their adherence to Rome. There were, besides the Metropolitan of Kieff and Terletsky himself, the Bishops of Brzesc, Polotsk, Chelm, Pinsk, and a coadjutor of the latter. Hypatius of Brzesc and Cyril were despatched by the Synod to Rome, with an offer of obedience, but not unconditional; for it contains this remarkable clause: 'We have given it them in charge to wait on your Holiness, and (if your Holiness will guarantee that we shall retain the administration of the Sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the Eastern Church entirely, inviolably, and as we hold them at the moment of union; and will promise that your successors will never innovate in this matter) to pay in their own, and in the name of us, and of the flocks committed to us, the obedience due to the See of Saint Peter, and to your Holiness, as the Chief Shepherd of the flock of CHRIST.' Two more prelates, those of Lemberg and Przemisl, had by this time been won

over, and the letter was therefore¹ signed by nine, of whom one died almost immediately. It is dated June 12 (O.S.), 1595.

Such an accession of prelates and territory was to be accepted on any terms. The deputies were most graciously received, and the Vigil of the Nativity, which was also Ember Saturday, was appointed for the public profession of their faith. It is curious to see how, in the account given of this Union, in the Bull *Magnus Dominus*, the prelates are treated as if they represented the whole Russian Church, instead of comparatively an insignificant portion of it. The part which treats on the reception of their Liturgy is as follows:—

'We receive them as fellow-members of CHRIST into the unity of the Catholic and the bosom of the holy Roman Church, unite, annex, and incorporate: and, for the greater signification of our love towards them, we permit, of our apostolic clemency, concede, and allow, to the same Russian Bishops and Clergy the ceremonies which, according to the institution of the holy Greek Fathers, they employ in the Divine Offices, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the administration of the other Sacraments and other rites, so that they be not opposed to truth and to the Catholic faith, and do not exclude communion with the Roman Church.'

And Paul V. still further confirmed and strengthened this permission by a Bull of 1615.

Hypatius and Cyril had no sooner returned home, than a second council was held at Brzesc, in which the proceedings of the deputies were approved, and the acts of the Union received. Thus began that Unia, which, after making such extraordinary progress at its commencement, fell suddenly, and was swallowed up by a truer Union in our own time. Job, Patriarch of Moscow, lost no time in condemning the acts of the Council of Brzesc, and in excommunicating the prelates concerned in it; and thenceforward began a terrible and bloody struggle between the partisans of the Orthodox and Uniat Rites in Poland, Lithuania, and White Russia. Under the Uniat Metropolitans of Kieff, Michael Ragosa, and Hypatius Phocieu, considerable progress was made by gentle means. The people, seeing no difference in outward rites, retaining their own Slavonic, hearing the unaltered Creed, knowing that the profession of the Unia was a stepping-stone to honours and emoluments, and caring very little for a papal supremacy, which they did not understand, flocked into the new Church by thousands, and thus emboldened its authorities to proceed to greater changes. The Creed was altered, the services shortened, Latin vestments introduced, and, curiously enough, Polish made to take the place of the old Church Slavonic in some of the services. Hence great discontent and complaints.

¹ It can be read in the Appendix of Documents to Theiner's *Neuesten Zustände der Katholischen Kirche beider Ritus*, at p. 11.

The Bishops of Lemberg and Przemisl had scarcely joined the Union, when (influenced by the authority of Constantine, Duke of Ostrog, a centenarian, who yet retained almost the full vigour of his youth, and at whose expense, and by whose solicitations, the Scriptures were first translated into the language of White Russia) they again forsook it. But it was under the Uniat Metropolitan, Joseph Rudsky (1613—1635), surnamed by Pope Urban VIII. the Athanasius of Russia, and the Atlas of the Union, that more violent means were adopted to compel the peasantry to embrace it. The tyrannical landed proprietors of Poland closed all the Orthodox churches; whole villages remained without a sacrament; Orthodox churches were given on lease to the Jews, who exacted a rent for every Eucharist. Such violence naturally aroused resistance: the successor of Rudsky, Kunciecvicz, was murdered, and consequently beatified by Rome; and then began a persecution which has scarcely a parallel. Multitudes who persisted in retaining the Orthodox faith, were tortured to death at Warsaw. Some were boiled alive, some burnt, some roasted, some torn to pieces with iron cats; while, in White Russia, children were in like manner butchered, for no other crime but that of their baptism. The horrible barbarities which for twenty or thirty years branded Poland with infamy, make one cease to wonder that she has long since been blotted out from the category of nations. In process of time the Unia lost her Little Russia; the Uniats in that province returned to their native faith, and the strength of the Uniat Church lay in Poland chiefly. Yet here its clergy were despised by both Roman Catholics and Orthodox; its Bishops were never allowed their promised seat in the Senate, and, notwithstanding the papal authority had forbidden those of one rite to forsake it for the other, it was universally regarded as a stepping-stone to the pure Roman Church. Still, on the division of Poland, the Uniat Church remained, and reckoned, in 1825, under its Metropolitan of Wilno, and its three Bishops of Polotsk, Lukoff, and Brzesc, more than fourteen hundred thousand persons capable of receiving the Sacraments. It is well known that, on the 6th of March, 1839, all this multitude, amounting (children included) to nearly two millions, were received, under their three Bishops, into the unity of the Eastern Church. ‘*Ex tam atroci Catholica Ecclesie inflicto vulnere, perspicitis, venerabiles Fratres,*’ said Gregory XVI.; ‘*quo tandem animo sumus, quaque intrinsecus ægritudine conficiamur. Dolemus atque imo ex corde ingemiscimus redactas in æternæ salutis discrimur tot animas, quas Christus suo sanguine redemerat; dolemus violatam turpiter per discolores Episcopos fidem illam, quam Romanæ Ecclesie prius desponderant; dolemus pessime despectum ab*

'iis characterem sacratissimum, quo ex hujus Apostolicæ Sedis auctoritate fuerant insigniti.'

In the Nestorian Unia, so often attempted, we do not, indeed, find a vernacular service, because the Syrian Liturgy of that body presents, of course, a dead language to them, as well as to us; but it embraced the element of a national language, and so far falls within our subject. The office of the Patriarch of the Nestorians had become hereditary, descending from uncle to nephew in the same family. These claims were rejected by the clergy in 1551, who chose one Sulaka to fill the vacant post. But being unable to obtain the requisite number of three Metropolitans for his ordination, they applied to the 'Pope of the West;' and on his consecration by Julius III., the use of the ancient Liturgy, with a few corrections, was allowed, and the Nestorian body was thus rent in two, the Latinizing portion being governed by Mar Simons, the original communion by Mar Eliases. The former soon again renounced connexion with Rome, and thus two Nestorian Patriarchs arose instead of one. But in 1681 commenced a Unia, as well from Nestorians as from Jacobites, which continues to this day; and here also unaltered rites and unchanged language have been found very useful in bringing over converts to the new Church.

We are now in a condition to offer some remarks on the course pursued by Rome with respect to a vernacular language.

And, first, it must be admitted that there are some very great advantages to be derived from the adoption of one ecclesiastical tongue in one patriarchate. At the time, to translate the Liturgy into hundreds of barbaric languages was in itself impossible; and from the very nature of the case, could it have been preferred, would have been most perilous to the faith. Again, when they were consolidated into shape and form, when they developed strength and beauty of their own, when long theological teaching had given them theological terms, then arose more strongly the rivalry of nations, which wanted some external sign that they belonged to one Church. Their office-books were not verbally the same. Three large districts of western Europe—Milan, Spain, and Gaul—long maintained, as the former does still, essentially different rites; and the Latin language was the only outward symbol of internal union. It must also be allowed that the clamour for a vernacular service has generally been rather national than religious. Whatever might have been the case with Huss and Jerome of Prague, those fierce Bohemian chiefs who drew the sword at their command, did it for the sake of Tcheck, and not of religion; just as in former times, princes of Bulgaria and Bans of Croatia had disdained to see their native Slavonic expelled by the usurping

Latin. But when a great part of Germany might have been preserved to the Church by the same concession—that was early made to Illyria—the Roman office-books in their own tongue—then the case surely becomes widely different. What was at first prudent caution is now converted into jealous obstinacy. Why might not Rome have obtained the advantages which Luther wrested from her—that of not only giving a translation of the Scriptures, but, by that translation, of actually forming a language? For every one knows that his version formed that *German*, which we at present allow to be the queen of all Teutonic dialects, and that to his residence at Wittenberg is owing its greater affinity with the Alemannic than with the Platt Deutsch. And so, to a certain extent, it is with our own English version.

‘Who will not say,’ asks a writer in the ‘Dublin Review,’ ‘that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country. It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of the church bell, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the gifts and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of the English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of righteousness about him whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible.’

One should think that a question must naturally follow in the mind of a Roman Catholic,—‘Why did not we do this? why did we leave it to “heretics” to frame so tremendous an engine against us?’ If a version had never been made at all, it might have been easier to reply; but, as this principle has been since abandoned, why was it not yielded when it might have been yielded with such comparative graciousness, and to such exceeding advantage?

To return to the language of ecclesiastical services. It is clear that only three systems are practicable; and that the division which they involve is exhaustive. You may, as Rome does, employ a dead, immoveable tongue; you may, as England and Russia do, take bygone period of your own language, and crystallize your prayers in that; or you may revise them every forty or fifty years, so as to render them intelligible through the varying phases and improvements or corruptions of the tongue.

Of the three, we cannot but feel that the last is the worst. Continually to be altering the Creeds, the Litany, the other

prayers, has the look of tampering with the Truth itself. If the poor saw the words of their Prayer-book altered, they would be less shocked at its doctrines being touched. The words are the Malakoff, so to speak, which defends the Sebastopol of our faith. Assault them successfully, and the stronghold will ere long surrender. It is a grand symbol of the changelessness, or, as Dr. Newman happily expresses it, the *incorrigibility* of the Church, to find that, though her expressions go out of fashion, she retains them still; though, in the mouth of the world, they have come to mean the very contrary of that which she means, she will not, for all that, give them up. It is well also that there should be a language of devotion, which is so utterly different from the expressions of every-day life; that, as the Church retains her ancient architecture, in all its contrast to the fittings of a modern drawing-room, so her stern, masculine,—if it be so, uncouth—expressions stand out against the mincingness and effeminacy of the terms of a luxuriant age. And therein are we especially happy, that by our adoption of *thou* and *ye*, we can elevate and devotionalize our style at once. No other European people can do it to a similar extent. The German *du* must suggest the fond intimacy, the *ὁμοιωτὴς*, of intimate friends, as well as the address suited to the voice of prayer; and the French *vous* must, save from long habit, be painfully familiar. It is strange that French writers have not attempted to introduce, in their translations of Holy Scripture and of the Breviary, that more venerable and impressive idiom which they might possess if they would; such, for example, as those lines which sum up the Ten Commandments in every Catechism from Antwerp to Bayonne:—

‘Un seul Dieu tu adoreras, et aimeras parfaitement.
 Dieu en vain tu ne jureras ni autre chose pareillement.
 Les dimanches tu garderas, en servant Dieu dévotement.
 Tes père et mère honoreras, afin de vivre longuement.
 Homicide point ne seras, de fait ni volontairement.
 Luxurieux point ne seras de corps ni de consentement.
 Le bien d'autrui tu ne prendras, ni retiendras injustement.
 Faux témoignage ne diras, ni mentiras aucunement.
 L'œuvre de chair ne desireras, qu'en mariage seulement.
 Biens d'autrui ne convoiteras, pour les avoir injustement.’

This reads like a section from our own Prayer-book: and what a wonderful contrast does it present with the modern language of the Lord's Prayer!—‘Notre Père qui êtes aux Cieux, Que votre Nom soit sanctifié, Que votre règne arrive, Que votre volonté soit faite sur la terre comme au Ciel,’ &c.

These difficulties of language naturally suggest the question, Whether, after all, it is not possible that the present Roman system of parallel translations, explanations in the most familiar

language, and so on, may not after all give her poor a far more intelligent idea (we are now speaking simply of the intellect, not of the affections) of her offices than is generally imagined? while our Elizabethan dialect, not being so explained, is much less comprehensible to them than we choose to believe it? To those of tolerable education there can be no doubt that ours is the system which best enables them to worship with the understanding as well as with the spirit. The lowest classes who cannot read, can certainly comprehend some part of our Prayer-book, can certainly not understand one word of the Breviary—or rather Vespers, the only part of it with which he is likely to be conversant. But for the poor man who can read, and that is all, the '*Petit Paroissien*,' and works of a similar stamp, must be more comprehensible, we think, than our own office, so that they were made as accessible to them—which they certainly are not.

But then it must be remembered that, in the point of a vernacular use, Rome has more nearly retraced her steps than in any other point of discipline which she ever maintained. At the outbreak of the Reformation, she opposed it with all her might. Her controversialists poured the most bitter scorn upon it; her advocates, then often more zealous than learned, denounced it as unheard-of, as profane, as scandalous. And yet gradually, and almost imperceptibly, the use gained strength within her communion, and she accommodated herself to its permission,—in hymns, especially in processional hymns; in the reading of the Gospel in French or German after its having been read in Latin; in Litanies; then in translation of the Breviary, or of the Missal (the Canon excepted). And though the versions which so often occupied the pens of the Jansenists were so loudly and bitterly condemned, everywhere throughout Europe the practice of vernacular services has increased, and is on the increase. And the last phase of active Romanism, Oratorianism, as it exists in England, seems utterly to regret all the old traditions of the Latin language, to vernacularize as far as possible, (and in what wretched, slip-slop English!) and to assume that the new practice will be one great means of bringing back this country to the fold of S. Peter. Why what is now so much put forward was three hundred years ago so bitterly to be opposed? is a question which we are not called to answer.

One natural consequence of this use is the general disregard which has attached itself among the people, to every service, excepting Mass only, and which has, by the addition of the Benediction at Vespers, made that office a sort of adjunct or correlative to Mass. And this is a late introduction, designed, as it has most amply done, to popularize a service at a convenient

time of the day, and of convenient length. The enormous congregations which flow to Benedictions in one of those glorious old cities of Belgium, or in the Tyrol—what a wonderful sight they present! How they make the heart of an Englishman burn within him, that his own Church Service could be rendered as popular, could attract such thousands of worshippers!

Again, the vernacular Litanies now spreading so widely, and encouraged so freely throughout Europe, form a great change from mediæval Rome. We have often enough, in Picardy or Flanders, heard in the early morning the coarse, gruff voices of fishermen, giving all a good hearty response in their patois, 'S. Etienne, P'iez pour nous; S. Laurent, P'iez pour nous.' We remember when, some years ago, a recently established confraternity took possession of, and restored, one of the little *igrejinhas* with which Madeira abounds, and said a Portuguese Litany there early on Sunday morning, that a gentleman with whom we were acquainted went to hear it, accompanied by his man-servant, a Scotch Presbyterian. 'Ah! Sir,' said the latter, when they came away, 'it did my heart good to hear that! It put me in mind, for all the world, of our singing in — Kirk.' In Spain too, and principally by the effects of the association called the *Corte de Maria*, the same Litanies are coming into vogue. We recollect entering a church at Palencia one evening, and finding the nave occupied by some female members of one of its offshoots—a striking scene, in their black dresses, and with their tapers gleaming through the dark church—one of them intoning, and the others taking up, *Estrella de la mañana—Ruega por nosotros—Salud de los enfermos, Ruega por nosotros—Refugio de los pecadores, Ruega por nosotros.* But the most remarkable thing of the kind we ever witnessed, was in one of the wildest mountain glens of Portugal, and at a little chapel called *Nossa Senhora do Desterro*. It was in the grey of the morning, and our party were about to mount their mules; when the west door of the *ermida* opened, and the priest, an elderly man, came out on all-fours, followed by a congregation of some twenty or twenty-five, in a similar fashion. They thus went round the chapel by the north side first, and, having finished its circuit, re-entered by the west door; and as they went, they recited—for there was no kind of attempt at chanting—one of these Litanies. The ground was excessively rough and broken, and the effect anything but edifying; nor did we ever see another exhibition of a similar kind; yet, as our muleteer took it as a matter of course, it cannot be uncommon in that unvisited district of the *Estrella*.

Rome, then, at the present moment, would seem to be sanctioning what she does not openly command—the very general

use of vernacular prayers in church. One thing would seem from past history to be certain, that no civilized nation which has ever left the Church, has been brought back to it without this permission. Belgium is scarcely an exception, for that country can hardly be said to possess a national language, divided as it is into Flemish, and Walloon, and mixed districts. Had Rome, with her usual tact, seized the moment at the reconciliation of England by Cardinal Pole, and given, together with a strict revision (such as was bestowed on the Roman), a version of the Sarum Breviary and Missal, who can say what would have been the effect among a people then well accustomed to a national rite, what on our language, and what on ourselves?

This is a mere dream. But an interesting and very difficult problem of the same nature is likely soon to come before us. The revision, or rather enlargement of the Prayer-book, is a work which cannot be much longer delayed. When once the subject is fairly brought before English Churchmen, they will see that the cautious conservatism of merely working up old materials into new services, is one which can satisfy nobody, and will equally offend those who would be offended by any change. We *must* have a new Evening Service. We *must* have an authorized Office for the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards. We *must* have a greater variety of Collects for the great variety of temporal wants; for example, those of travellers, and for the infinite number of spiritual necessities unmentioned in the Prayer-book. These things lie ready made to our hand in the same treasury whence our former Collects were derived; and they need only translation to be, as they once were, the support and comfort of many Christian souls.

But then, how is this translation to be done? If we are to have the modernisms, the verbiage, the diluted wretchedness that appears every now and then in our occasional services, it will be indeed the new cloth fastened on to the old garment, and it is easy to foresee the event. As it is, the hundred and twenty years which elapsed between the earliest and latest parts of our Prayer-book, have made no difference, except perhaps to the ear of a philologist, between its most ancient and its most modern parts. The prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men, and the General Thanksgiving, would scarcely be recognised by an uninstructed person as emanating from a different age than that which produced the Sunday Collects, *so far as language goes*. And it is remarkable that, in the revision of the Prayer-book threatened by William III., the principle was clearly adopted of writing the new Collects in the old Church language. One sits down to a perusal of that book with a most lawful and righteous prejudice against all its contents;

but it is impossible not to allow that, incomparably inferior as these Collects are to those which they were intended to supplant, they are better in matter, and infinitely better in expression, to that which might have been expected from their writers. Again, in their still later revision, the non-jurors carefully retained the older language; and the Scottish Church, in its Communion Office, has, with scarcely an exception, done the same. It is earnestly to be hoped that similar care will be taken by our future revisers, whoever they may be; and that, while they steer clear on the one side of the affectation of archaïsing, so on the other their language will be in simple harmony with that of the older book; that they will not so write as that a common reader may say, 'Here the old ends, and here the new begins;' that they will not, in short, build on a classical chapel to a Middle Pointed church.

It is only since the above article was in type that Mr. Trench's 'English, Past and Present,' has come in our way. We mention this, with the double purpose of warmly recommending this little book, and of defending ourselves against a charge of plagiarism, from the coincidence of some of its remarks with the observations on the Prayer-book which have been offered above.

ART. V. *Jashar. Fragmenta Archetypa Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti textu passim tessellata collegit, ordinavit, restituit, in unum corpus redegit, Latine exhibuit, Commentario instruxit* JOANNES GULIELMUS DONALDSON, S. Theologiæ Doctor, Collegii S. S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses quondam Socius. 1854. Prostat Londini, apud Williams et Norgate; Berolini, apud Wilhelm Hertz.

THIS volume is an attempt by Dr. Donaldson to restore, translate, and illustrate an ancient book, which he supposes to have been composed partly from original, partly from preexisting writings in the time of Solomon, and to have been the most precious possession of the Jewish Church. His work is written in Latin, because it is addressed *ad Clerum*; it is printed and published in Germany, because it is in that country that investigations and views such as Dr. Donaldson has here put forth are, he thinks, most likely to meet with readers who will duly estimate and feel interest in them.

We need scarcely say that the volume is the work of a scholar, of a man of great ability, extensive knowledge, ingenuity, and acuteness. The Latin, though the author professes to throw aside the bondage of Ciceronian phrase, flows with the natural and classic grace which belongs to one to whom the language is as a mother tongue. The illustrative matter is drawn from every kind of literature, out of the stores of an accomplished and well-informed mind. The composition is free, flowing, and clear, as that of one thoroughly interested in and master of his subject. But the work is that of a person of wild and unrestrained imagination, who lives in a world of his own, and seems to be without the capacity of appreciating the value of evidence, not to mention more grave faults.

Dr. Donaldson's favourite pursuit hitherto has been comparative philology; and that study, perhaps, more than any other at this day, tends to seduce the mind into the practice of mere conjecture and theory, and to produce a habit of guessing and imagining, and of theorizing on very slight grounds, or on no grounds at all, and then becoming thoroughly convinced of the objective truth of that which has no existence whatever but in the mind of the imaginer. Such has been the danger in the study, at a particular point in its history, of almost every science. Chemistry and its cognate pursuits long continued in this childhood of science; geology has but recently grown out of it. Our own day has seen archaeology pretty nearly set free from it, and facts and careful reasoning have taken the place of imaginations

which created evidence for themselves, which saw what no one else could see, and were blind to obvious facts which were utterly fatal to their theories. It is no disrespect to comparative philology to say, that it still labours under the disadvantages which belong to the early stages of every science—that its facts and its principles are not yet sufficiently established to make us listen to a mere philologist, only because his pursuit has been the comparison of languages. In a subject so tempting, Dr. Donaldson's mind has found kindred matter of thought; and now, turning from investigating the originals of languages, he has engaged in an attempt to discover and restore certain supposed originals of the sacred books of the Hebrews.

It would, we think, have been well if the knowledge of Dr. Donaldson's writings could have been confined to those for whom he intimates that he intended them—those who could really judge of their value. In that case we would gladly have left them, in the confidence that they would, on the whole, have done little harm. But in this day such confinement is impossible, and Dr. Donaldson's views and statements will certainly be spread widely, with all the weight attaching to his name in the pursuits of philology and the antiquities of the early literature of the world, without persons being aware of the utter groundlessness of his notions—of the absence of evidence, philological or archæological, for the views he has put forth—or of the recklessness and wantonness—for so we must characterise it—with which he deals with a subject that, even if it were not most sacred in itself, and intimately connected with the religion, with the very groundwork of all Christian faith and morality, would, for mere truth's sake, deserve a different handling. We propose to give a simple account of this work—of the views which it advocates, and of the reasonings adduced to establish them. We trust to do so honestly and fairly. If we incidentally express our own feelings, if those feelings affect the tone of what we write, we shall trust to the common sentiments of mankind to excuse us; whilst we carefully guard ourselves against allowing those feelings to affect the fairness of our representations.

We ought to say, first of all, that the work consists of a Dedication to Lepsius, as one deeply versed in studies like the author's own; a short and clearly-written preface, to which are appended full tables of contents and of texts of Scripture cited, explained, illustrated, or emended in the work; the Hebrew text of those parts of the Scriptures in which, according to Dr. Donaldson, portions of the Book of Jashar are contained, are then given, according to the received text; then follow the prolegomena; then the seven parts of the supposed book, in a Latin translation, each being followed by a commentary, setting

forth Dr. Donaldson's grounds for thinking it a part of his imaginary book, his views about its composition, about the true reading and meaning of the text, and illustrations of its matter.

In order, however, that our readers may become acquainted with the mind of the author, we think it best to give the first specimen of his arguments which meets a reader. It will show the facility with which Dr. Donaldson builds up a theory, by a series (we trust we are not unfair in what we say) of assumptions and conjectures, and then gives to this airy creation of his own brain the solidity and firmness of demonstration. The specimen is a very fair one, and in itself not uninteresting; it occurs in the *Prolegomena*, cap. ii. pp. 8—13. The author is here engaged in showing the importance of 'searching the Scriptures,' not with the view of learning more of Divine truth, of what is revealed respecting God, or of making progress in piety and practical religion, but in order to discover in them what had never been suspected before. The specimen is, indeed, Dr. Donaldson's own, given by him as a proof of the advantage to be derived by religion from his method of investigation.

S. Paul says (1. Cor. xv.) that our Lord, after His Resurrection, appeared to S. James. It has been generally supposed that this appearance is not recorded by any of the Evangelists. Dr. Donaldson conceives that he has discovered that it is, and in the process of his argument goes very fully into inquiries respecting the relationship of the Apostles, and puts forth, as certain matter of fact, many things which neither we, nor, we apprehend, they themselves, ever knew or suspected before.

He proceeds thus:—First, he gives the lists of the Apostles as they are found in the Gospels; in these the twelve are found, up to a certain point, to be mentioned in pairs. First we have Andrew, and his brother Peter, who was brought by him to Christ. Then John, that other disciple of the Baptist, who, says Dr. Donaldson, 'without doubt' (*proculdubio*) brought his brother James to Christ (there not being the slightest intimation or ground for believing that he did so). Next came S. Philip, and he brought Nathanael to Christ (see S. John i. 40, &c.) Now, as Bartholomew is a patronymic name, it has 'always' (*semper*) been rightly inferred that Nathanael and Bartholomew were the same (the conjecture is highly probable, and of late has been generally received, but far from 'always'). And as Philip and Bartholomew are connected together in each of the lists of the Apostles, it 'would not be absurd to suppose' that they were brothers, the sons of Thalmæus. (Philip was of Bethsaida, and Nathanael of Cana—John i. 44; xxi. 2—but this Dr. Donaldson does not notice.) So that the first six

Apostles were three pairs of brothers. That which 'it would not be absurd to conjecture' has now become a settled matter of fact. Next S. Matthew is the same as Levi, the son of Alphæus (a disputed point, but assumed as certain by Dr. Donaldson); and Thomas is mentioned with him, and Thomas means 'a twin'; but Eusebius somehow, in one place, confounds Thomas with Thaddæus or Judas. All this (he says) cannot be satisfactorily explained, without supposing—1. That Matthew and Thomas were twin brothers, the sons of Alphæus. 2. That Thomas (the twin) was a surname, the Apostle's proper name being Judas. 3. That there was another Judas called Lebbæus. 4. That Thaddæus was another form of Judas. 5. That Thomas relinquished the name of Judas, lest he should be confounded with Judas Lebbæus. Here we must admire Dr. Donaldson's ready perception of brotherhood among the Apostles. But to proceed. Who is James the son of Alphæus? and who is Judas the relative of James, otherwise called Thaddæus and Lebbæus? James is another brother of Matthew (*i. e.* of Levi, the son of Alphæus) and Thomas; and Judas Lebbæus is his son. A critical reason is given from the Greek, *viz.*, that if he had been his brother and not his son, it would have been expressed thus, *Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ*, as it is in the case of 'James the son of Zebedee and John his brother.' As to the statement in the first verse of S. Jude's Epistle—'Jude the brother of James'—it has been proved by this critical argument that he could not be the brother of James; and, besides, the writer of the Epistle could not have been S. Jude the Apostle, or an Apostle at all. After eight Apostles, then, have been mentioned in pairs, as being brothers, we now have a pair consisting of father and son, coupled together, James and Thaddæus, or Lebbæus, who is Jude 'the son' of James. It appears, therefore, that Alphæus was the father of three Apostles, and grandfather of a fourth. Lastly, come Simon Zelotes and Judas Iscariot; but the last-named Judas was the son of Simon (John vi. 71). No doubt this Simon is Simon Zelotes the Apostle; and accordingly in the lists in S. Matthew and S. Mark, the traitor and his father are coupled together. It might be enough to say that these relationships are merely imaginary, the argument from identity of names being obviously valueless, when out of the twelve Disciples of our Lord, we have two Simons, two Jameses, two (or, according to Dr. Donaldson), three Judases. And the mere fact that such relationships are never, in the most distant way, alluded to, when it was the custom of the Hebrews to mention relationship, and it would have been the most natural and easy mode of determining the parties, is of itself decisive against such a view, unless there were real and valid

proof of it. But then Alphæus the father of S. Matthew, S. Thomas, and S. James, and the grandfather of S. Jude, is the same as Cleophas, the husband of Mary, the sister of S. Mary, and 'mother of James;' but Cleophas and another disciple were the two that were walking together to Emmaus. Now, what is more likely than that Cleophas should be taken into the country by his eldest son James; and if the second of these two were James, might he not have told it to S. Paul, with whom he was on terms of great intimacy? *q. e. d.* Thus we discover a fact of great importance, an undesigned coincidence between S. Luke and S. Paul in respect to that great groundwork of our belief—the witnesses of the Resurrection. To say nothing of the many improbabilities of these theories, Dr. Donaldson has overlooked one circumstance, which blows down his edifice like a child's house of cards. The appearance to S. James was *after* the appearances to S. Peter, to 'the twelve,' 'to five hundred brethren at once.'¹ Dr. Donaldson identifies it with an appearance on the day of the Resurrection to an Apostle, and the father of three of the twelve, who yet did not know, nor had heard any rumour, of our Lord's having really risen.

We now proceed to give a sketch of Dr. Donaldson's theories respecting the Book of Jashar, its origin, date, and matter.

The view which he entertains is this (Præf. pp. i. ii.) that in the reign of Solomon, through the enjoyment of long peace and prosperity, the Israelites, who had before been hindered by continual harassing wars, first cultivated a literature, and that works of various kinds were then sent out. Besides the writings attributed to Solomon himself, there were genealogies and histories of the patriarchs, 'the Book of the Wars of the Lord' (Numb. xxi. 27), and sacred songs respecting them; epic-like tales about the Judges, and histories of David; and particularly a religious and moral work, called the 'Book of the Upright, or of Uprightness,' containing both old and recent hymns, &c., and various other matters, which will be fully stated hereafter. And this book was compiled by the Prophet Nathan, by the direction of Solomon, and probably with the aid of Gad the Seer. It was the first literary production of the Schools of the Prophets.

The books, which we call the Books of Moses, were not, in Dr. Donaldson's view, composed till after the Captivity, with the exception of the Book of Deuteronomy, which was most probably written by Hilkiah the Priest, in the reign of Josiah. When these books, and those of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel,

¹ 'He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. *After that*, He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, He was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all He was seen of me also, as one born out of due time.'

—1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

were composed, the different portions of the Book of Uprightness, as well as other productions of the reign of Solomon, were worked up into them, very irregularly indeed, and with many mistakes as to their collocation, still so worked up, that by skilful criticism they may be recovered, and the book restored; and the task which Dr. Donaldson proposes to himself is thus to recover and rearrange the scattered fragments, and so to restore this book to its original form; just as, he says, one might try to restore a piece of architecture out of the fragments which are still to be found built into the houses which have arisen near its ruins.

Jashar, then, is an imaginary work, created out of imaginary materials; which, had it been on the subject-matter of the early lays of Rome, or the fragments of Etruscan laws, would have been admirable for the learning, and the ingenuity, and the real contributions to criticism and archæology, which are incidentally brought out by it, in which the writer's want of perception of the value of evidence and his wild dreams would have been the occasion of many a smile,—but which, applied to the Book of Books, that wherein is contained the Revelation of the Will of God, the teaching of His Holy Spirit—the work, as it were, of His Hands—is simple impiety.

It is fair, however, to Dr. Donaldson to say, that he professes (see Proleg. cap. i. pp. 1—6) to believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, by which he means that a certain Divine spirit runs through the whole, and that if you look to the books considered in their general argument and connexion, there is contained in them, *i. e.* in their harmony and agreement, a revelation of the Divine will and truth; and this notion of Divine truth being 'contained in' the books, not of the books themselves being true, Dr. Donaldson maintains, is confirmed by the expression in the Article of the Church of England, that 'Holy Scripture *contains* all things necessary to salvation;' not that all its words and syllables have the impress of Divine authority, but that the revealed will of God is so *contained* in these books, 'That whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as 'an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to 'salvation,' *i. e.* not that what may be proved by Scripture is to be believed, but what cannot be so proved is not to be required to be believed.

There is here, we must observe, as throughout his work, the greatest unfairness in Dr. Donaldson, who makes no middle course between his own view, according to which the Old Testament is a mass of falsehood and folly, and that which would hold every word and letter to be in such sense inspired, as that

the words of the Pentateuch, as commonly understood, should be taken as absolute authority in geology.

Dr. Donaldson here adopts the words of a book, of which, it seems, he has been supposed to be the author, the authorship of which he would have held to be a great honour, whether he agrees with all that it contains or not:—'Protestant Principles considered in their Results.'

Having thus removed the obstacles which any other view of inspiration might have opposed to his free handling of our sacred books, Dr. Donaldson proceeds (pp. 7, seq.), with a profaneness which is simply shocking, to adopt as the motto of his proceedings the words of our Blessed Saviour, 'Search the Scriptures;' not as seeking 'life' there—not in order to learn more of the Divine will, of our own duties, hopes, prospects—but to discover something (Dr. Donaldson says) which has never been found out before—searching as for gold in California or Australia, for all manner of facts, if facts they can be called, which have eluded the researches of previous inquirers. And as a specimen of his discoveries in this way, he himself gives the *morceau* which we have already presented to our readers respecting the appearance of our Lord to S. James, and the relationships of the Apostles; this being the fruit of his labour on the Gospels alluded to at the beginning of the extract which follows:—

'Quodsi talis labor in singulis Evangelii narrationibus consecretandis non sine fructu ponetur, quid facies in casca vetustate Pentateuchi exploranda? Profecto, ut ait Cicero (De Finn. i. 3), "nec modus est ullus investigandi veri, nisi inveneris; et quaerendi defatigatio turpis est, quum id, quod quaeritur, sit pulcherrimum." Ut in Californiae convallibus et saxosis Australasiae campis, ita in tota sacrorum librorum serie haud ita penitus defossum delituit tamen aurum, quod indagatoribus immensas divitias supeditabit.'

—Pp. 13, 14.

We quote this also as a specimen of Dr. Donaldson's graceful style; for such it unquestionably is.

Further (Proleg. cap. iii. pp. 14—19), he lays it down as a principle, that the writings of which the Bible is composed have not come down to us in their original form, but have been altered in many ways, but yet are capable of restoration. He excepts the Epistles of S. Paul and the other Apostles; and, save a few additions, the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of S. John. But the Gospel of S. Matthew is a (poor) translation, an 'adumbration' of the original; that of S. Mark is imperfect, and may also be a translation; that of S. Luke is a congeries from several sources. By considering this, he says, we may explain many difficulties in the Evangelists: for instance, *one* demoniac among the Gadarenes, *one* blind man at Jericho, only are mentioned by S. Mark and S. Luke; *two* in our Greek of S. Matthew. How is this? Why, the translator mistook one of two Syriac words—

Dr. Donaldson is not sure which it was—for a word meaning 'two;' (חָדָה, *unus, aliquis, quidam*, or חָדָה, *iste*, for מְרִין *duo*) in itself an improbable supposition, and almost impossible when we consider that the translator must have found the singular number throughout each narrative, and have had to alter it himself into the plural. Also there is a curious blunder by which 'the parts about Magdala' became Dalmanutha; *dal* being a piece of the word Magdala, and *manutha* the Syriac for 'parts.' These are Dr. Donaldson's two specimens of 'gold.' How different from those true treasures which the pious student of Holy Writ discovers, which are 'more to be desired than gold—yea, than much fine gold!'

Now if, says Dr. Donaldson, we can make such discoveries as these in the Gospels, what, arguing *à fortiori*, may we not find in the books of the Old Testament, considering that we are so much more in the dark concerning their origin, and have in fact only, as he says, the Masoretic compositions of the great synagogue, made after the time of Ezra, and compiled out of the old histories of the origin of the people, the annals of the Kings, and the literature of the reign of Solomon? On these two bases, then, that the first books of our Old Testament Scriptures were chiefly made up out of old books in and after the time of Ezra, and that they have no special divine character beyond a certain general spirit and argument, Dr. Donaldson proceeds, not merely to pull down the sacred edifice in which we have been used to worship, but to build up a new one out of the fragments which he finds there, and especially to restore one, the chief of these originals out of which the Bible is made—the Book of Uprightness, Jashar; in doing which he assures us he is, without any doubt, giving us the very marrow and kernel of the Old Testament, in that he presents to us the very volume which was composed by prophets under the direction of Solomon, and constituted the very citadel of the Jewish faith.

All this dream is put out as true and solid fact; but it will be found to be utterly and absolutely baseless, having no foundation but a series of the merest conjectures. Only we have to be upon our guard, to remind ourselves continually that it is baseless, because Dr. Donaldson is perpetually speaking of the book as if he had it before him, arguing what is and what is not a part of it, dividing it into parts, restoring and correcting its fragments; producing an impression of its real existence, just as the details of Defoe's stories, of Mrs. Veal and her dyed gown, or the artful circumstantialities of lies, address themselves to the imagination, and gradually fix on the mind, as truths more effectually than if they had made good their ground by convincing the reason.

Now 'the Book of Jasher' is mentioned in two places in the Old Testament only: in the tenth chapter of the Book of Joshua, verse 13 (we adopt the English version): 'And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.' And again, just before the beginning of David's lament over Saul (2 Sam. i. 18), 'Also he taught the children of Judah *the use of* the bow; behold, *it is* written in the Book of Jasher.'

The first question is: What was this Book of Jasher? The context of the passages in which it is mentioned would lead us to suppose that it was some book of metrical chronicles, or poetic annals of the people, which, like our own old chronicles, was continually receiving additions as the progress of time supplied fresh facts to be enrolled in it; so that decisive arguments could not be drawn from a citation of it, as to the time at which the books that cite it were written or at which it was itself composed: nor could its name throw much further light upon the subject.

But this very obscurity is the delight of the theorist. A distinct and legible inscription is open to every one to read; no acuteness is necessary to decipher its characters, no recondite erudition to bring together illustrations and arguments for its meaning one thing rather than another. But let it be well-nigh obliterated, let there be scarcely one single distinct letter left, and it opens a rich field of inquiry, and affords ample scope for critical and historical disquisition. No one writes essays on the inscription on the Monument of London, but a few worn-out letters found on a tablet dug up in Cannon Street might furnish materials for many a disquisition and many a controversy.

It does not, however, appear to Dr. Donaldson a worthy occupation to deduce what the Book of Jasher was, merely from the contexts in which it is referred to. He elicits its nature and its contents from its name, *Jashar*. This name has been indeed most variously interpreted, but subject to qualifications; he adopts the interpretation of Gesenius, "The Book of the Upright" (in the Vulgate, "The Book of the Righteous,") 'is a collection of old Hebrew poems.'¹ But at this point Gesenius went wrong, for he added, 'So called from its containing the praises of upright men, or from some other cause, whatever it may have been; for the Orientals are wont to take titles for their books from subjects and words which have often

¹ 'Liber probi, scil. proborum (*Vulg.* Liber justorum), est anthologia veterum carminum Hebræorum.—Proleg. cap. iv. pp. 20—25.

'but little connexion with their subject.' Thus the learned Gesenius saying, as it were, 'The inscription is quite illegible—no argument whatever can be drawn from the name.' In his Manual, however, Gesenius ventures on a further conjecture: 'Provided,' he says, 'it can be proved that יִשָּׁר is used of 'warlike excellence (*de bellica virtute*), you might translate the 'title, "The Book of Valour," *liber virtutis*;' and for a corresponding title he refers to an Arabic collection called 'Valour.' Here Dr. Donaldson is astonished at Gesenius's mistake (for the interpretation, 'The Book of Valour,' were fatal to his whole scheme), and at this learned Hebraist's giving up the case. He seizes, as it were, on the inscription which Gesenius declares to be illegible, and open only to the merest conjectural interpretations, and declares that it can be most clearly and satisfactorily made out.

'Jashar' means 'a moral and religious man;' and specially the Israelites, as being, by profession, the worshippers of the true God: in the same way that 'righteous' was technically used; and so Jashar was a kind of special name for good Israelites. Nay, it is the root of the names of the people, 'Israel' and 'Jeshurun;' the other derivations of Israel in the Book of Genesis being mistakes of the compiler.

It is clear from this, Dr. Donaldson says, (*i. e.* from a conjectural and most disputable interpretation,) what the Book of Jashar was. 'It was undoubtedly a collection of ancient poems 'and other records bearing on religion, and on the history of the 'worshippers of the true God;' and 'we must necessarily conclude that this book was a *Sylloge* containing all those fragments 'which taught the rules of religion, the marrow of the law; which 'exhibited the nature of uprightness, or celebrated the victories, 'declared the blessedness, promised the future happiness of true 'and sincere Israelites.' This is inferring a good deal more than he has any premises for; but let us observe what follows, for which there is absolutely no foundation whatever: that portions of this book are wrought into our Scriptures. Two citations are made from the Book of Jashar, by name; and we have no reason in the world to suppose that any part of it whatever besides is anywhere extant; yet Dr. Donaldson coolly goes on: 'Whatever there be of this character wrought up in the sacred Scriptures of the Jews, which can be regarded as an ancient fragment, 'that doubtless will claim a place among the remains of the 'Book of Jashar, and return there as to its proper home.'

As to the date of this imaginary book (we are throughout giving exactly the substance of Dr. Donaldson's Prolegomena, see cap. v. pp. 25—27), every consideration confirms what at first sight is most probable: that these ancient poems were

collected, written out, and put together in the reign of Solomon. But more particularly: 1. The collection was later than the time of David, because the Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan was a part of the book. 2. In the blessings of Jacob and Moses, which *are most certainly* parts of the Book of Jashar, all the tribes are mentioned as still united. Therefore, the collection was made prior to the revolt of Jeroboam. (From the same consideration we might have argued that the Book of Genesis was written before that revolt.) 3. In that Blessing the word מִכְרָה, 'a sword,' occurs; but this is the Greek word μάχαρ, and, therefore, the composition is later than the time when David had his Cretan guards, the Cherethim, which was in the latter part of his reign. (It appears afterwards, p. 196, that there are many other interpretations of מִכְרָה, and it looks very much like a proper Hebrew word derived from כּוּר, as Delitzsch held, while Maurer connected it with the Ethiopic, and Dathe with the Syriac. But as if two languages might not have similar words, Dr. Donaldson chooses to say it is the Greek word, and, therefore, this was written in the time of Solomon.) 4. 'Shiloh' in Jacob's blessing most probably is a form of Solomon; therefore, the Song was written in his reign. (Of course it is not a prophecy, but written after the events, and pretending only to be one; Jacob himself being a mythical personage, representing the Israelitish nation.) 5. As this book of *Uprightness* turns on God's having made man *upright*, and that is the very expression of Solomon (Eccles. vii. 30), it is plain that Solomon is the most likely person to have been the author or adviser of the work. (We must leave Dr. Donaldson to maintain the genuineness of the Book of Ecclesiastes against his German brethren; that one passage has secured his convictions.) 6. David subdued the Edomites, but they recovered their independence under Solomon; and this is distinctly referred to in that fragment of the Book of Jashar (Gen. xxvii. 50), Isaac's blessing Jacob and Esau; therefore, the book was not compiled before the days of Solomon.

Is it possible for any one more entirely to disregard the laws of evidence than the writer of this book? Dr. Donaldson *imagines* what the meaning of the name, and thence what the nature, of the Book of Jashar was; then *imagines* it was used by the supposed compilers of the books of the Old Testament; then he selects the portions which he fancies were parts of it; then he argues from the contents of these parts the date of the work; and, as it appears that many of the poems were not only brought together by Solomon, but were actually written in his time, falsely pretending to antiquity, the result is, that the Book

of Uprightness is proved at last to be a book of falsehood and deceit.

But further let us see what guidance Dr. Donaldson imagines we have for determining what portions of the Old Testament Scriptures belonged to the Book of Jashar.¹ First, we connect Solomon's words, 'God made man *upright*,' &c., with the title of the book; and we see that the history of man's being created upright and falling away from that state, and the history of the upright people, must form a part of it. Then, as a law given of God by Moses was the foundation of Israelitish piety and virtue, some portion of the book must have consisted of this, and we must seek for some fragments of it in the books of the law; to this must be added the promises of future happiness, and the blessings promised to obedience. Next; of the two passages cited from the Book of Jashar, the first shows us that it contained songs of victory, celebrating the triumphs of the upright: the second, that the exploits of David were recorded in it; and it is not probable that Solomon would omit his own. Lastly, we have the evidence of the prophet Micah; he lived in the reign of Josiah, and might therefore have the entire Book of Jashar in his hands (for it had not yet been broken to pieces to frame our present books). Now he transcribed the very words of the Book of Jashar, 'Tell it not in Gath.' (Micah i. 10; 2 Sam. i. 20.) He alludes to the prophecy of Balaam, (Micah vi. 5,) which every one would regard as part of the Book of Jashar; he often cites the book of Deuteronomy, which is almost entirely made up of portions of the book of Jashar; and, what is of the greatest weight ('*quod præcipue valet*,') he uses the word 'Jashar,' 'upright,' (c. vii. 2,) as if he would refer his readers to this very book. The passage thus referred to is as follows:— 'The good man is perished out of the earth, and there is none *upright* among men.'

Is all this, we may naturally ask, a jest of Dr. Donaldson's? Does he put out these follies to make game of his readers? Is his book, published in Germany, and designed for German readers, intended to be a caricature of 'Biblical criticism?' Is it like the 'Historic Doubts respecting the Existence of Napoleon,' or as the 'Life of Scriblerus,' intended under a humorous form to refute by the argument *ex absurdo*, and to expose to just ridicule the lucubrations of such theorists, at the same time exhibiting Dr. Donaldson's great learning and ingenuity? Certainly his argumentation is mere mockery of the reasoning faculties of his readers, and reminds us of the jest put out some years ago, where persons were advised in their arguments to choose for their premises things as far removed as possible from their

¹ Prolegomena, pp. 27, seq.

conclusions, in order that, 'whilst your opponents are puzzling themselves to discover a connexion which never existed, you may build on their silence as defeat.'

On all this kind of argument, it is obvious to remark that it labours under one fault: there is no real evidence as to what the Book of Jashar was, or that any part of the Old Testament was taken from it; and, further, there is no clear ground on which any one part of the books of the Old Testament could be determined to belong to it. There are two citations from the book: allow it: these citations may fairly be supposed to be specimens of the collection; and it would seem from them to have consisted of poetical annals, or hymns celebrating the martial exploits of the Israelites. The existence of such a collection is both intelligible and probable; such works, whether written or unwritten, belong to the early literature of every nation: nor is there in the case before us the slightest ground for supposing that it was anything else. We have no right to argue from anything so uncertain as the name of the 'Book of the Upright,' that its contents were anything besides what these citations prove and suggest, and Gesenius' explanation might have sufficed. But to determine on such a ground as that *יָשָׁר* means 'upright,' the whole contents of this supposed book, and to draw out of the Old Testament its imagined fragments, is a mere amusement of fancy, unworthy in itself of any serious refutation.

We will proceed, however, to set before our readers what Dr. Donaldson holds to have made up this book. He imagines that it was divided into several parts; these being, according to the sacred number, *seven*. (Ibid. pp. 28—30.) The first part sets forth how man was made upright (*יָשָׁר*), and fell into sin. Of this we have two fragments, distinguished by the well-known difference in the name used for the Most High; the first using the name God (Elohim), the second the Lord (Jehovah). This difference of terms in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis, has been often noticed and adduced as an argument for the use of older materials by the writer of the book. The first fragment is called *Elohistaë carmen*; the second, *Jehovistaë*.

The first fragment (pp. 37, 38) Dr. Donaldson makes to consist of portions now disjoined and displaced; some being combined by the compiler with the history of the flood. He takes the last verses of the history of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis (Gen. i. 27, 28); then the beginning of the history of the flood, (Gen. vi. 1—6,) putting the third verse after the sixth, and inserting the twenty-first verse of the eighth chapter between the third and fourth verses, making it run thus, according to the English version:—

- Gen. i. 27, 28. God created man after His own image,
After the image of God created He man;
Male and female created He them.
28. And God blessed them,
And said;
'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth,
And subdue it.
And have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over
the fowl of the air,
And over every living thing that moveth upon the face of
the earth.'
- Gen. vi. 1, 2, 4, 5. And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the
face of the earth,
And daughters were born unto them,
2. And the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they
were fair;
And they began to take unto themselves wives of all whom
they chose.
4. There were giants on the earth in those days;
For after that the sons of God came in unto the daughters
of men,¹ and they bare children unto them,
The same became mighty men, which were of old, men of
renown.
5. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in
the earth,
And that every imagination of his heart was only evil
continually,
- Gen. viii. 21. For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.
Gen. vi. 6. And it repented [God] that He had made man on the earth,
And it grieved Him at His heart; (3.) and God said:
My Spirit shall not always reign in man,
On account of their sin, that is, flesh;
But his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.'

We give Dr. Donaldson's version of the latter part.

It will be seen that even here Dr. Donaldson has been obliged to alter the very marks by which he professes to discriminate the fragments. In the text of Gen. vi. 6. the Divine name is the Lord: this he has altered to God, and marked as an alteration, ('Videt autem [Deus] quod,' &c.) In the third verse, also, he has altered the reading in the same way, but not marked it; we have printed the word in italics. It is also worth observing, how improbable it is, that any compiler, in prefixing the account of the six days' creation to this extract from Jashar, would have used the name Elohim only. The verses which Dr. Donaldson has thus severed are plainly part of the one narrative of the first chapter.

The next fragment is that in which the name the Lord (Jehovah) is used. He calls it a fuller and poetical description of the same event. He makes it consist of Gen. ii. 7—9; then, omitting the description of the localities of Eden, of verses 15, 18, 25; and of chapter iii. omitting verses 20, 22. Such is a specimen of the wanton way in which this work is done.

¹ There is, we presume, a misprint here in the original.

It is in a commentary on these passages (pp. 41—79), that Dr. Donaldson has indulged in a foulness of imagination, and a minuteness of detail in expressing his thoughts, which he has in vain attempted to justify. A few hints at the interpretation which he proposes would have sufficed, even on his own showing. It is impossible for us to do more than say, that the sin of our first parents is supposed to be that of carnal concupiscence; that many words are translated differently from what they were ever before believed to mean; and that the whole passage is illustrated by observations suited to the filthy ideas on which the interpretation is grounded.

The second part (pp. 80, 95, with notes, pp. 95—132) sets forth the election of the family of Abraham as the upright, (אֲבִרָם,) and the rejection, 1. Of the descendants of Ham and the Canaanites. 2. Of the descendants of Cain. 3. Of the Hagarenes. 4. Of the Edomites. And consists of these portions, or 'Fragments,' I. Gen. ix. 18—27; II. Gen. iv. 2—8, and 8—16; III. Gen. xvi. 1—4, 15, 16 (xv. 6), xvii. 9—16, 18—26, xxi. 1—14, 20, 21; IV. Gen. xxiv. 32—34, with chapters xxvii.—xxix. and portions inserted from other places. But Dr. Donaldson tells us, the fragments of Jashar were greatly altered in the process of working them up into the Book of Genesis, and originally stood thus: '[Adam, *i. e.* man,] after (see Gen. ix. 18) he went forth [from Eden] begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet;' and so throughout the name of Adam is to be substituted for Noah. Then in verse 22, Dr. Donaldson inserts something which had been omitted by the compiler, but was really in the original, that Ham, when he had seen his father's nakedness, sent for his son Canaan, and that Canaan told Shem and Japhet, the two brothers of his father, &c. Such is the wantonness of the critic.

Then at the beginning of the so-called second fragment, Dr. Donaldson inserts into Gen. iv. 2, 'And Shem begat two sons, Cain the elder, and Abel his brother,' and so continues the narrative, with the extraordinary insertion in verse 7 of this passage, after the words which he translates, 'thou liest at the door of sin:' 'And the Lord said to Abel: Because thou hast done 'this thing, and hast believed me, therefore have I accounted 'it to thee for righteousness: and therefore thou shalt be 'Lord over thy brother, and unto thee shall be his desire,' &c. (the insertion being made up out of Gen. xxii. 15; Gen. xv. 7; Gen. xxvii. 29). He also in verse 8 reads the words that are found in the Septuagint: 'And Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go into the field,' &c.

The third fragment, on the rejection of the descendants of Hagar and the Arabians, has this introduction by Dr. Donaldson: 'And Abraham, the son of Abel, married his relation Sarah.'

The fourth begins: 'And Isaac married Rebecca, a connexion of his father and mother.' And then, after the blessing of Esau (Gen. xxxix. 40), comes this strange insertion of a passage, partly taken from other places of Genesis: 'Then Esau became a 'Cainite, and was called not as before Esau the son of Isaac, but 'Lamech, the son of Methuselah; and he, when he had departed 'from his father, married wives, Ada, the daughter of Elon the 'Hittite, who was also called Judith, and Zillah, the daughter of 'Anak the Hivite, who was also called Aholibamah. When, there- 'fore, he had gotten a sword and a spear, he sang thus boastingly 'to his wives: Ada and Zillah, &c.,' from Gen. iv. 23. (See Gen. iv. 18, 19; xxvi. 34; and xxxvi. 2.) There are other insertions throughout of passages from divers parts of the book of Genesis. The 'fragment' concludes with the list of the wives and children of Jacob.

So the 'mythical' genealogy of the patriarchs would be: Adam, otherwise called Noah; he had three sons, Shem, Ham, Japheth; Shem had two sons, Cain and Abel; Abel was the father of Abraham, who had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac; Isaac was the father of Esau and Jacob, but Esau afterwards was called Lamech (and Methuselah Isaac, we presume), and married two wives, who, like himself, had each two names: Jacob's wives and children, the mythical representatives of the twelve tribes, are named as in the Bible.

These 'fragments' are illustrated; and Dr. Donaldson's selections, collocations, and insertions are maintained by notes, which bring together all kinds of matter (shall we say, to bear on the subject, or to be attached to it?) from every quarter, in strange incongruity, and without any real logical connexion.

The argument of the third part is said to be: 'The upright 'Israelites having escaped from Egypt, and spent forty years in 'the wilderness, and undergone many other vicissitudes, at last 'dedicate a temple to the Lord, in a land of peace, under Solomon 'their peaceful king.' The passages of which it consists are these:

Gen. vi. 5—14. 'And when the whole earth was lying buried under a flood of iniquity, and Israel walked uprightly and religiously, the Lord decreed that he should be delivered from the waves of the tumultuous Rahab, and come at length into a land of peace. An ark was therefore constructed at the command of the Lord, in which he should sail over the waves of the wickedness of
Gen. vii. 6, 11. the earth. And Israel was 600 years old, when he entered into
(12.) the ark. He wandered through the wilderness, as through the billows of the sea, forty years. And when these forty years were passed, Israel sent forth a raven, [to seek out a peaceful dwelling]; but the raven flew away, and returned, but brought no news.'

Then come the verses (Gen. viii. 8—11) about the dove, sub-

stituting Israel for Noah; which is thus connected with what follows:—

- ‘And Israel knew that the waters were abated from off the earth.
 Gen. v. 29. ‘And that he was made a man of rest (Noah).
 Gen. viii. 4. ‘And having got a peaceful dwelling on the mountain of holiness,
 ‘He rested there in the seventh month, on the seventh day.
 1 Kings vi. ‘There he built a magnificent house of God (Bethel).
 1 Kings viii. 43. ‘There being always before God (that is, in Peniel).
 Deut. vi. 18. ‘And doing that which is right and good,
 Ps. v. 8. ‘He religiously worshipped the Lord in His holy temple.’
 Cf. Ps. xlviii. 9.

The history of the Deluge, then, is a mythical or parabolical account of the peaceful settlement of the children of Israel in the Promised Land. The raven is the spies first sent out, who brought an evil report of the land; the dove, the good Israelites who desired to go into the land.

To go through the profaneness, the mockery alike of reason and religion, with which this whole subject is treated, would be shocking alike to our readers and ourselves. It is plain that Dr. Donaldson considers the sacred records as anile fables, which are a fair subject for every kind of mockery and derision.

We proceed with our painful task. The fourth part (pp. 150—157) contains the Law. In the Book of Jashar this consisted of portions of what was afterwards enlarged by Hilkiah, the high-priest in the reign of Josiah, into the Book of Deuteronomy; which is therefore the most ancient portion of the so-called Books of Moses. This alone, Dr. Donaldson argues, was known to the prophet Micah, and is cited by him, and this alone, he says, is sanctioned by our Saviour; a statement plainly contrary to fact, though Dr. Donaldson endeavours to establish it at pp. 163, 164. If any one were to suggest that Micah referred to the history of Balaam in the Book of Numbers, we are told that this is quite a mistake,—that the prophecy of Balaam was indeed extant before the time of Micah, but it was as a part of the Book of Jashar, afterwards compiled into the Book of Numbers; a proceeding which renders argument well-nigh impossible. The selections, which Dr. Donaldson classes in three parts, are called by him *Three Fragments*:—

1. Deut. v. 1—22, being the Ten Commandments.
2. Deut. vi. 1—5; (Levit. xix. 18); Deut. x. 12—21; xi. 1—5; 7—9; which he calls the Marrow of the Divine Law.
3. Deut. viii. 1—3; vi. 6—25; the Inculcation of Obedience: inserting, however, out of the Book of Leviticus (xix. 18) the precept, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,’ and omitting Deut. vi. 19, ‘to cast out all thine enemies before thee, as the Lord hath spoken.’

Dr. Donaldson gives the following reasons for constructing this fourth part of the Book of Jashar: ¹—1. It is most probable, not to say unquestionable, that the Book of Uprightness contained precepts of uprightness. They would be the very kernel of the book, and therefore, most probably, would be found in the middle of it, making the fourth of the seven books. 2. These precepts are to be found embodied in the Book of Deuteronomy. Dr. Donaldson here compares that book with the other books of the law, in a tone of profane disparagement of those books, though it is out of one of them that the second great commandment of the law has been taken. 3. Micah cited the Book of Deuteronomy only, but it was not the Book of Deuteronomy itself, but the Book of Jashar; for if any one alleged (as we said before) that he referred to the history of Balaam in the Book of Numbers, we are told that that was a part of the Book of Jashar, that the ritual portion of the law was not extant in an authoritative written form, before the Captivity. Dr. Donaldson argues from the many passages in which the moral are preferred to ceremonial observances, and the disparaging terms in which the latter are spoken of, as by David, Samuel, and the Prophets; and infers that there was not then any Divine sanction for such observances, and that the Book of Deuteronomy, or rather that of Jashar, in which the moral law only was contained, was alone known; as if the very reason why the people were in danger of exalting the ceremonial observances were not the Divine sanctions by which they were confirmed; as the very same tone is found most unquestionably after the establishment of the ceremonial law, as of Divine obligation, in the Apocrypha and the New Testament. 4. But our Lord gave His sanction only to the Book of Deuteronomy, neglecting the rest of the law. Here Dr. Donaldson suggests that the books of the law were in separate volumes, and known rather to the Pharisees than the people; as if the whole of the law was not regularly read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day, and, as is clear from the New Testament, familiarly known to the people. By 'the law,' he says, 'our Lord meant only the Book of Deuteronomy,' notwithstanding the numerous citations of the other books as of fully equal authority, and of the passage of Leviticus (xix. 18) repeatedly, as the most important part of the moral law. When our Lord, for instance, said He came to fulfil the law, He only meant the Book of Deuteronomy: when He spoke in the well-known and received language of 'what is written in the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms respecting Him being fulfilled,' (Deut. xxiv. 44,) he referred to that harmonious

¹ Pp. 158—179.

teaching of the *Book of Deuteronomy*, the prophets, and Psalms, which Dr. Donaldson had before shown to be that, not sacrifices, but piety is acceptable to God; although it is manifest that our Lord was speaking of predictions of His own death and resurrection verbally contained in the Jewish Scriptures; and no one, before Dr. Donaldson, supposed that the Law of Moses meant only the Book of Deuteronomy. It is surely a waste of time to attempt to refute so reckless a writer.

The fifth part¹ consists of Benedictions and Admonitions, and is made up of the Blessings of Jacob, from Gen. xlix.; the Blessings of Balaam, from the Book of Numbers; and the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. xxxiii., with such omissions as Dr. Donaldson thought fit to make. These Blessings, he conceives, were written in the time of Solomon, and described the condition of the tribes at that day; save that the last portion of the prophecy of Balaam, 'And ships shall come from Chittim,' &c., was added after the expedition of Alexander. The prophecy so called not being a prophecy (the *possibility* of prophecy he does not deny), but a description of what had happened, could not contain these words, as the event did not occur till long after the time of Solomon; and the passages in the Song of Moses, respecting the privileges and dignity of the tribe of Levi, could not have been a part of what was written in the time of Solomon; because the prophecy of Jacob, which describes them as they were at that time, contains no reference to the exaltation of the Levites to the sacerdotal offices, and represents them only as men of violence: 'Simeon and Levi are brethren: instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.' They were men of violence, vagabonds, like the Greek ἀγύρται. This Dr. Donaldson,—taking the two Levites mentioned in the Book of Judges to be specimens of what they all were,—imagines to have been their character; and asserts that they did not attain their priestly influence till the time when the young king was saved from Athaliah's violence by their means; and, after the Captivity, through the instrumentality of Ezra and others, who were of the Levitical families. 'Hence,' he says, 'the tithes and other privileges of the Levites; hence the rites and ceremonies, and the rest of the farrago of the Pharisees; hence the edition of the Pentateuch, throughout enlarged and altered.' As if there were not allusions to the ritual and ceremonial law in the Prophets and the historical books; incidental and slight, indeed, but enough to show that it existed and was recognised; and, even when broken and neglected, was regarded as of Divine authority,—allusions which, from the very circumstance

¹ Pp. 180—232.

that they are incidental, and sometimes not obvious, are of the same value in proof.

Jacob, indeed, is but a mythical representative of the Jewish nation, and his sons of their tribes; Balaam existed in tradition; and, indeed, Dr. Donaldson thinks the notion of these words, the blessings of Jacob and Balaam, being really spoken by them too absurd to need refutation. The attempt to illustrate the blessings of Jacob, Balaam, and Moses, by the after history of the nations and the tribes, as if they were written in the time of Solomon, and describe their condition at that time, is interesting and able, but exaggerated and wild in conjecture, and having a semblance only of argument. For instance, the beautiful blessing of Joseph was a judicious flattery of the most powerful tribe. The prophecy respecting Judah and the Shiloh is thus explained:—The lion's whelp is David in his youth; the full-grown lion, the same king in his strength; the lioness with her whelps is Solomon. 'Poeta autem aptissime transit a recumbente læna ad tranquillum pacifici Solomonis regnum et auream illam ætatem qua Judæ frueretur. Significat ergo Judæ imperium permansurum esse, donec quies et cum quiete gentium obsequium Judæ obtineret. Vocem *שִׁלּוֹה* (the lawgiver) denotare scipionem longiorem quæ in interstitio pedum sedentis regis atque ad humerum ejus reponitur, (cf. *Æschyl. Agam.* 195, *ὅτ' αἰεὶ χθόνα βάκτροις ἐπικρουσάντας Ἀτρεΐδας δάκρυα μὴ κατασχέιν*.) satis ostendit ipsius loci phraseologia,' &c. He says there are three interpretations of Shiloh:—1. The Messiah; 2. The city Shiloh; 3. Solomon,—which last he adopts, giving this most unreasonable interpretation: that of the authority which the tribe of Judah had possessed in the reigns of David and Solomon only, it is said, 'The power shall not depart from Judah till Solomon come,' when, in fact, it had only come to it in the reign of his father. 'Binding his foal to the vine,' &c. shows the prosperity of the reign of Solomon, when vines were so abundant that people tied their asses to them as to worthless trees, &c.

The prophecy of Balaam is in like manner explained of the events of the reign of David and Solomon, and was written in the time of Solomon. It was not written *before* it, because Num. xxiv. 3 is in imitation of 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, though Hengstenberg thought he had shown that the passage in Samuel is an imitation of that in Numbers. On this one single frail support is the assertion rested. It was not written after it, because Micah speaks of Balaam's words as something old in his time: 'Remember what Balaam,' &c.; and because the song speaks of the Israelites as numerous and prosperous, which could not be said after the revolt of Jeroboam; and of the subduing the

Edomites and the Amalekites, which therefore were then, probably, recent events. 'Rem igitur undique contemplant *nulla* *'restat dubitatio, quin hoc vaticinium Solomone regnante confic-* *'esse ponam.'* Further it is 'proved' that it was written on purpose to be put into the Book of Jashar, that imaginary book—because it contains the two ideas of *אִשָּׁר* (blessed) and *יָשָׁר* (upright), which are involved in the name of Israel. 'At vero *'si nihil aliud esset ad hanc rem pertinens nisi votum illud (xxiii. '10); Let me die the death of the righteous (ut probi, יִשְׂרָאֵל)* *'ibi equidem non potuissem non agnoscere Jasharani libri spiritum ac materiem.'* Thus we have the author's own free and explicit confession of the very small amount, the almost infinitesimal quantity, of something which, if increased, might be tending to become evidence, on which he determines that a portion of Scripture is a fragment of the Book of Jashar. There is indeed a consistency in this. The ground on which it is determined that a passage is a part of the book, is exactly of a piece with the evidence on which the existence of the book depends. It is all in harmony, and, as it were, part of a system; like Berkeley's idea of bell-ringing bringing up an idea of a servant. So that one might compose out of it rules and examples of the Art of Imagination—after the manner of the Treatise on Baths.

We must pass by the commentary on the Song of Moses, and proceed to the next part of the book, where we for the first time meet with a portion of the real Book of Jashar.

This, the sixth part,¹ consists of Songs of Triumph for the miraculous victories and deliverances of the 'upright' people: and is made up of the triumphant songs—1, of Moses and Miriam; 2, of Joshua; 3, of Deborah. Here Dr. Donaldson says he has come upon firmer ground; we have the very portions of the book that are actually cited. Now, as there were three great deliverances of the people, it is probable we should find them all celebrated in the Book of Jashar. Dr. Donaldson considers the departure of the Israelites from Egypt to be an historical fact; and each of the three deliverances or victories, with the destruction of their adversaries, under Moses, Joshua, and Deborah, were effected by natural causes operating provisionally: by the reflux of the Red Sea, aeroliths, and by the combination of hailstones and the flooding of the river Kishon, in each of the three cases. Of the song of Moses he thinks that verses 1 and 21, 'Sing to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously,' &c. may have been sung at the time; and that the rest of the song was composed before the time of David.

¹ Pp. 233—239.

The comments on the 'Song of Joshua' are introduced by an exposition of the writer's notion respecting the miracle of the sun and moon being stayed. He supposes that the words cited from the Book of Jashar are a poetic prayer that the people may destroy their enemies before sunset, (forgetting entirely that the moon is mentioned also,) and that the writer of the Book of Joshua mistook the meaning of the document, and turned it into a miraculous fact; and, by the way, attacks Mr. Morgan Cowie about a sermon of his at Cambridge, (one of his Hulsean Lectures,) in which he commits the unpardonable mistake, if mistake it be, of interpreting Jashar, 'truth,' making the words mean—'Is it not written in the book of truth? Is it not true?' So frail is the foundation of Dr. Donaldson's theory, that the truth of this interpretation would destroy it entirely.

He proceeds, then, to the conjectural restoration of the 'Song of Joshua;' the existence of such a song having been proved by the 'facts' that there were in the Book of Jashar songs of Moses and Miriam, and of Deborah, and therefore must, undoubtedly, have been one of Joshua—one portion of a dream being thus alleged as proof of another.

But in order to its restoration, he argues thus: (we will quote his own words, in order that our readers may see that we have not overstated the irrationality of the arguments which Dr. Donaldson brings forward:)—

'Ad carminis nostri integrationem quod attinet conjectura opus est. Nam verba ipsa in narratione Masorethica inclusa teneri nemo crediderit qui Judic. c. iv. cum Deborah cantico comparaverit. Ibi enim (Jud. iv. v. 14) Debora Baraquum eodem modo quo hic (v. 8) Jehova Josuam hortatur; nempe, hostes infesta acie oppugnandos esse; nam Deum eos in Israelitarum manus tradidisse. De quo tamen oraculo silet Deborah epinicius. Filium habemus, quæ nos ad aliquam certe amissi thesauri partem quasi manu ducat. Nam vocem *חַסְדִּים*, quæ *benignitatem* denotat, in illa Mosis oratione ita usurpatam videmus (Exod. xv. 13), ut vi quadam sua significaret summum favorem quo Jehova Israelitas prosequeretur. Talem divinæ benignitatis significationem in Josuæ victoria præsto adfuisse, non poterat ignorare vates ille, qui istam victoriam celebrabat. Jam vero exstat Psalmus (cxxxvi), in quo singuli versus in eandem formulam desinunt: scilicet, utrum sensus præcedentis versiculi absolutus est, an imperfectus, illico subjicitur: *יְיָ הוֹשִׁיעַ הָעָם מִכּוּל יָדָיו*, "nam benignitas ejus (*i.e.* Jehovah) est æterna." Ceteroqui iste Psalmus cum eo qui statim præcedit in collectione nostra tam in ordine sententiarum, quam in verborum atque imaginum delectu mirum in modum congruit. Concludimus igitur hos Psalmos a communi quodam fonte derivatos esse. Quæ sane opinio eo confirmatur, quod prior Psalmus frequens est locis aliunde desumptis. Nam ut taceam v. 1, 2, 6, 15 sqq. qui ex Psalm. cxxxiv. 1, 2; cxv. 3; cxv. 4 sqq.; totidem verbis repetuntur, v. 7, qui ad Jerem. x. 13; li. 16 referri potest; habemus in v. 14 citationem carminis Jasharani (Deut. xxxii. 36), et in Psalm. cxxxvi. 12, recurrit phrasia illa, quæ sæpius in Pentateucho usurpatur, ut in Deut. vii. 19. Jam vero, ut Dathius monet, convenientia argumenti probabile facit Psalmum cxxxvi. in fundatione

secundi templi adhibitum esse, quod nonnulli maxime ex Esr. iii. 11 colligunt, ubi narratur: *reduces alternis choris Jehotam laudasse, quod bonus sit æternaque in Israelitis benignitate*; quæ ipsa formula est, in qua singuli hujus Psalmi versus desinunt, qua respondebatur alteri choro, prius hemistichion accincenti. Quæ si ita sunt, si Levitæ hunc Psalmum decantabant ad celebrandam iteratam promissæ patribus terræ possessionem, quid verisimilius, quam eos quasi ultro respexisse ad illam Josuæ victoriam non longe ab Hierosolymis partam, qua prima certam sibi sedem vindicassent Israelitæ? Et quoniam tunc exstabat Jasharana illa ovatio, quid verisimilius, quam eos inde desumpsisse atque in suos usus convertisse quidquid ibi conveniens atque accommodatum invenirent? Ut mihi quidem videtur, illa victoriarum quæ Josuæ pugnam statim antecedeant commemoratio, quam in utroque Psalmo habemus (cxxxv. 10 sqq. cxxxvi. 17 sqq.), multo melius cum antiqua ovatione, quam cum iterata Templi consecratione conveniret. Et quæ de Sole et Luna inducuntur (cxxxvi. 7—9) optime quadrarent in ultima Jasharani carminis commata, ubi Josua ista lumina alloquitur. Quid quod fulgura commemorantur (cxxxv. 7 sqq.), quorum in victoria Josuæ tantæ erant partes? Hunc locum, qui apud Jeremiam (x. 13, li. 16) bis occurrit, eo probabilius a vetere carmine desumptum esse deducas, quod iste propheta frequens est in libro Jasharano citando (cf. supra p. 160). Ergo quantum conjectura assequi possumus, Jasharanum carmen, quod in libro Josuæ nominatim citatur, iterum resarciri potest, si quedam in narratione ipsa vestigia cum iis utriusque Psalmi versibus ita compinguntur, ut justum poema inde renascatur. Id quod speciminis gratia tentavi.—Pp. 255—257.

We cannot but be pleased with the modesty of the concluding words, which scarcely has its parallel in the whole volume. The result of this conjectural restoration is—

‘CHORUS.

Ps. cxxxvi. 1. ‘I will praise the Lord, for He is good,
And His mercy endureth for ever.

‘LEADER OF THE CHORUS.

Ps. cxxxv. 5. ‘Of a truth I know that the Lord is great,
And that our Lord is above all gods.

[6.] For He hath done whatsoever pleased Him.

[7.] He bringeth forth the clouds from the ends of the earth,
Making the lightnings with the rain.

(Exod. ix. 24.) And hail mingled with fire,
Bringing the winds out of His treasures.

Ps. cxxxv. 7-9. He hath made great lights;
The sun to rule the day,
The moon and the stars to govern the night.

[11.] He led His people out of Egypt,

[16.] He led them through the wilderness,

[21.] And gave them the best of lands for a possession.

[17—20.] He smote great kings,

Yea, and slew mighty kings:

Sihon, king of the Amorites,

And Og, the king of Bashan,

Ps. cxxxv. 11. And all the kingdoms of Canaan.

‘CHORUS.

Ps. cxxxvi. 1. ‘I will praise the Lord, for He is good,
And His mercy endureth for ever.

'LEADER OF THE CHORUS.

- Jos. x. 5—11. 'The kings of the Canaanites came,
 Five kings came against Gibeon.
 Then rose up Joshua and went from Gilgal,
 Joshua, and the strongest of the Israelites with him;
 He attacked the enemies unawares, routed, strawed them
 down;
 The kings flee with their armies, they flee,
 From Gibeon to Bethhoron, Azekah, and Makkedah.
 And the Lord fought against them;
 He sent down a shower of stones from heaven,
 Cf. 1 Sam. xviii. And cast against them His burning arrows.
 6. [12, 13.] The sword of the Israelites slew its thousands,
 The arrows of the Lord slew tens of thousands.
 Then Joshua spake unto the Lord,
 And he prayed in the sight of Israel,
 "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,
 And thou, moon, upon the valley of Ajalon."
 And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
 Until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies.
 Exod. xv. 11. Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods?
 Who is like Thee, glorious in holiness?
 [13.] Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people whom Thou
 redeemed.
 Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habi-
 tation.

'CHORUS.

- Ps. cxxxvi. 1. 'I will praise the Lord, for He is good,
 And His mercy endureth for ever.'

Had all Dr. Donaldson's work been as beautiful and as innocent as this, had it all been modestly put forward as a mere conjecture, as a play of fancy, as an attempt at showing the brilliancy of his genius and the cleverness of his conjectural faculty, we should have been thankful. We regret that we cannot give our readers the Hebrew of the poem thus composed; it would stand in the place of an exercise—a pretty exercise—of Hebrew verse-making. It is just as one might give boys a fragment of an Euripidean strophe, and desire them to restore the chorus.

The next song is that of Deborah, which was the subject of a composition of the author, published seven years ago. He says of it:—

'Ad Deborahæ hymnum triumphalem accedens gaudeo quod abhinc quinquennium hanc difficillimam fere totius Scripturæ pericopen ita tractavi, vix ut quidquam mihi laboris ac molestiæ exantlandum supersit (Prælectio Philologica in scholis Cantabrigiensibus habita a. d. IV. Id. Octobr. MDCCCXLVIII de Deborahæ cantico triumphali. Cantabr. MDCCCXLVIII). Nec præter commentarios, quos tunc inspexeram, ullum frugi bonæ additamentum mihi quidem innotuit, nisi excipias ea quæ Johannes de Gumpach (Alttestamentl. Studien, Heidelberg 1852, pp. 1—140) diligentius quam peritius disseruit. Nam quum multas emendationes tentaverit, plura cor-

rupit quam correxerat, nec universum cantici sensum melius assecutus est, quam ii qui præcesserant.)'—P. 261.

This is a fair specimen of the tone of superciliousness and self-complacency which pervades the work. In a note at page 263, we read :—

'Sophistæ illi Oxonienses, qui, quum quater anno tot et tanta Christianismi præcepta violent, tamen διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εὐλαβίαν διανοίαν profitentur, nescio cui vitio verterunt, quod hoc Jahelæ facinus improbaret. Perperam is sane sacram Scripturam interpretatur, qui mendacium, perfidiam, crudele dormientis hospitis homicidium, Deo ipsi placuisse existimat.'—Note, p. 263.

This, again, is a specimen of the bitterness against all sorts of persons, which is also very freely and largely expressed. Who are these Oxford sophists, and their quarterly acts of wickedness? Does Dr. Donaldson mean ourselves?

We are glad to give a more favourable specimen of Dr. Donaldson's composition, in the passage to which this note is annexed.

'Jam vero Jabinus noster, Chatzoris rex, idem nomen eandem dominationem habet, quam vetus ille Septentrionalium Canaanitarum signifer, quem Josua, si Masorethicos audis, multo ante devicerat. Illud quoque observatione dignum est, quod in hac historia Jabinus ille minor, si non idem fuerit, haudquamquam quasi actor appareat. Omnia per Sisram geruntur—Sisra ferreos currus in unum locum congregat—Sisra aciem instruit—Sisra devictus fugit—Sisræ mors, quæ bellum finiverat, Jahelæ male illam quidem conciliatam gloriam inchoat. Quid quæris? Sisra iste, non Jabinus, personam tyranni induit, et Jabinus vix aut ne vix quidem in scenam prodit. Qui criticam historię methodum experiendo tentaverit, is profecto non dubitabit, quin Jabinus, i. e. ἡ, "prudens," "intelligens," generale esset nomen, sive patrium seu potius epitheton, omnium regionis Canaaniticę regum. Eodem modo invenimus multos veterum Ægyptiorum *Pharaones*, Philistęorum *Abimelekos*, Græco-Ægyptiorum *Ptolemęos*, Babylo-niorum *Labyrnetos*, Cappadocum *Ariarathes*, Ponticorum *Mithradatas*, Syro-rum *Ben-Hadados*. Et quum Jabinus ille summus quasi muta sit hujus historię persona, rationi consentaneum esset arbitrari, Sisram procuratorem fuisse vicarium, qui mixtorum hominum provinciam principis nomine administrabat, colligebat vectigalia, et pensa victo populo facienda imponebat.'—Pp. 262, 263.

This is followed by a full grammatical and critical commentary on the song.

We now come to the seventh and last part of the Book of Jashar,² consisting of Various Poems on the Kingdom of the

¹ 'Hominis esset valde otiosi omnia perlegere quę de hoc Carmine conscripta sunt. Strictim quidem inspexi Poli et Rosenmuelleri farragines, quę nullam fere ante editam commentationem illibatam reliquerunt: ad manum habui criticam Dathili versionem, atque interpretationes G. H. Hollmanni (Halsę, 1818) et H. H. Keminki (Traj. ad Rhen. 1840); neque mihi ignota erant, quę commentatus est H. Ewald in libro cui titulus: Die poetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes (Göttingę, 1839, vol. i. p. 125). Sed frustra ubique quęssivi plenam ac veram hujus Capituli exegesisin.'—Note, p. 261.

² Pp. 290—345.

Upright, and their prosperity during the reigns of David and Solomon.

In this part are put—

1. The Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1—10), which is determined by Dr. Donaldson's criticism to be a hymn of triumph for David's victory over Goliath.

2. The Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 19—27), which, if this be the true meaning of verse 18, is an actual extract from the Book of Jashar; only Dr. Donaldson annexes to it the Lament over Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33, 34).

3. David's Song of Triumph and Thanksgiving, contained in Psalm xviii. and 2 Sam. xxii.

4. David's celebration of his own victories over the Syrians, and those of Joab and Abishai over the Edomites, being Ps. lx.

5. David's prophecy of the kingdom of the coming Messiah, being the 'last words of David' (2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7).

6. The Epithalamium of Solomon (Ps. xlv.).

7. The entering into and dedication of Solomon's Temple (Ps. lxxviii.).

These last two are divided, ingeniously but fancifully, into portions supposed to be sung by the chorus, the leader of the chorus, and semi-choruses of men and women.

With a commentary on these Psalms, the work is brought to a close.

We will cite the conclusion, in which Dr. Donaldson sums up what he has done, and sets forth his own views:—

'Atque ita ad finem perduxì laborem mihi saltim neque injucundum neque infructuosum. Quid tu censeas, lector benevole nescio. Mihi autem hæc scribo quasi pellicula quædam ex oculis decidere videtur. Non ut antea per nebulam, sed coram in aprica luce res gestas, litteras, religionem Israelitarum Solomoneorum discerno. Non ut antea vocem non explanabilem et perturbatam et verborum inefficacem audio, sed ipsissima Nathanis, Solomonis, Davidis, quinetiam aliquoties sublimia Mosis effata, a divinis penetralibus recentia, mihi in aures veniunt. Neque hæc vetustarum litterarum reintegratio aut vi aut clam aut precario ex canonicis libris detorquetur. Sponte se offerunt fere omnia istius rei testimonia. Constat enim fuisse librum qui 𐤒𐤓𐤕 inscribatur. Constat vocabulum 𐤒𐤓 Dei ipsius probitatem designare, eam hominis conditionem significare, qua primitus est creatus, atque eos mores, eam indolem describere, quæ veros Israelitas (Joann. i. 47; cf. Rom. ix. 6) a reliquo mundo distinguebat. Constat hunc librum 𐤒𐤓 tam epinicia vetusta, quam pœmata ad Davidis historiam pertinentia complexum esse. Constat multa esse in textu Masorethico tessellata carmina, quæ unamquamque vocis 𐤒 vim atque significationem expleant. Verum enimvero quandoquidem tam in præmissis quam in universa conclusione rem non dubiam sed apertam atque manifestam habeam, enumeratio singulorum argumentorum non est necessaria. Dico ista carmina in unum corpus, suis membris exactum, ita demum redacta esse, ut omnia ibi congruentia agnoscas; et si quis mecum hac ratione contentus erit, nobis sane illam libri Jasharani diu defletam jacturam quadamtenus saltim resartam esse gaudentibus, exclamare licebit, populus

quod clamitabat, Osiri invento: *εἰρήκαμεν, σπυχαλῶμεν!* Quæ redintegratio utrum omni ex parte rite sit effecta, criticorum erit, classica, ut vocatur, philologia imbutorum, atque universa grammatica probe eruditorum, quum unumquodque argumentum suo momento ponderaverint, ita demum discernere; et, quod jam antea significavi, non spero fore, ut omnibus omnia et singula persuasurus sim. Dico autem atque confirmo non aliam rationem in Sacris Libris tractandis adhibendam esse, quam qua profanorum scriptorum interpretatio tanta cepit incrementa. In hac materia jam per trecentos annos doctrinam suam, ingenium, acumen, subtilitatem, industriam, fatigarunt homines omni laude cumulatissimi; hic regnant illi; hinc facem aliis ministrant, qui quoscunque scientiæ campos collustrare cupiunt. Nam si philologia, ut Bœckhius autumat, nihil aliud est quam *cogniti cognitio*, una est ista scientia et ad materiam qualemcunque adhiberi potest. Hanc igitur rationem in scholis Hebraicis studiose amplectendam censeo. Quodsi philologo vel in sacro Textu examinando suum munus constabit, grammaticorum erit potius quam theologorum de hac tractatione iudicium facere. Ad theologiam autem quod attinet, mihi quidem, qui Sacerdos sim et Doctor Anglicanus, satis esse debet, quod nulla in hoc libro vel opinio vel sententia ad Articulos nostros impugnandos quovis pacto conferat; quod legitimam interpretandi libertatem, ab Episcopo concessam, ab Academia confirmatam, nusquam migravi; quod salva hac argumentatione professionem meam in extenso iterare possum; immo etiam quod oppugneratum illud ordinis mei officium aliter præstare nequeo. At enimvero, quod multo majoris momenti est, quam canonica ejuspiam Ecclesiæ constitutio, aut ecclesiastici ejuspiam hominis integritas, in hoc opusculo demonstrare conatus sum non modo Vetus Testamentum Novo contrarium non esse, verum etiam omnia in utroque libro uno concantu decurrere; Jasharanam pietatem tam in primis Pentateuchi capitulis quam in epistolis Paulinis præceptam esse, ratam, exercitam; religiosam antiquissimorum Israelitarum doctrinam eam esse quam ab ecclesia Christi edocemur, scilicet, naturæ nostræ dichotomiam in eo unice versari, quod etsi homo *caro* sit et mortalis, *spiritu* tamen vivenscat, et eo quidem divino nec morti obnoxio, quippe quia a Deo emanet, qui universæ carni spiritum suum infuderit (Num. xvi. 22; cf. Jes. xxxi. 3) et spiritaliter fidos homines regenerare possit; neque aliam esse sacramentalem illam, quam perhibemus, Sacræ Scripturæ indolem, nempe augustos illos libros, qui visibiles sunt et corporei, spiritu tamen invisibili animatos esse. Denique, quum ad Fidei Christianæ patrocinium accedimus, advocationis nostræ interest, ut simulata illa suburbia et propugnacula, quæ primo hostium impetu perumpentur, sedulo omittentes vel potius ultro dejicientes, in arcem inexpugnabilem confugiamus, quæ omnia ad necessitatem salutis pertinentia custodit, nec cupide tueamur eas hominum opiniones quæ defendi nequeunt, sed illorum exemplo admoniti qui casam cito ruituram in fluxu ac diffuentibus arenis ædificantes pietatis naufragium patiuntur, solidam ecclesiæ nostræ ædem sempiternis veræ doctrinæ fundamentis stabiliamus.—Pp. 345—348.

If any one were to talk of refuting Dr. Donaldson, the first thing to be considered is, that Dr. Donaldson has proved nothing; that is, as to his general argument, on the character, date, composition, and contents of the Book of Jashar, he has absolutely proved nothing. We have to remind ourselves of this again and again. When we read page after page of the undoubted certainty of all that Dr. Donaldson imagines; when the characteristics of the book come to be assumed as known,

so far as to be the basis of entire courses of argument; when we hear the book spoken of as familiarly as if we had it in our hands—it requires a distinct effort of mind to throw off the impression, and to recollect that there really is no reason to suppose there ever was a Book of Jashar, such as Dr. Donaldson has depicted.

Persons tell lies till they believe them; and persons may hear them till they believe them, if they are only repeated sufficiently often, and with abundance of circumstance. And so it is with theories; with theories on all kinds of subjects. If you only go on arguing as if they were true, finding confirmations for them, drawing out their consequences, using language based upon them, you come to forget their baselessness, and believe them real. So with this Book of Jashar. The allowed citations from it, in the Books of Joshua and Samuel, do not suggest that the book was at all such as Dr. Donaldson has imagined. As to the argument from the name, our author is singular in his opinion about the meaning of the word, Book of Jashar; and even if he were correct on this point, which that singularity makes highly improbable, it affords no ground for more than the very faintest conjectures as to its contents. Lastly, there is not a shadow of ground for supposing that any parts of the book beyond these citations are contained in our Scriptures.

But, after all, this is not the important point. No reasonable person, we apprehend, will believe in the existence of such a 'Book of Jashar;' we can scarcely bring ourselves to think that Dr. Donaldson believes it himself. But the principles on which Dr. Donaldson bases his investigations are such as these: that there is no sacred character at all in the Old Testament Scriptures as we have them; accordingly, these books themselves are treated as foolish and fabulous compositions—put together at a late period, by persons who intended to deceive, and who did not understand the materials out of which they were making up their compilations, and so Dr. Donaldson does not hesitate to use the most contemptuous language respecting them, by way of contrast to his Book of Jashar.

Dr. Donaldson holds that they are to be treated on the same principles of criticism as profane writings; which is, in fact, assuming the very point at issue: and, accordingly, he throughout argues that the song of Jacob could not have been spoken by Jacob, because of his extreme weakness, or preserved, because it was not likely any one would write it down. He determines the date of a prophetic composition, on the view that it must have been written after the events to which it seems to refer. Thus the song of Hannah must have been written after the accession of Saul, because it refers to a King, to the Lord's

Anointed (the Messiah or Christ). This is one instance of the application of the principle, that the same rules of criticism apply to the Old Testament as to any other ancient book—though we have the distinct testimony of our Lord and His Apostles to the Divine character of the books, and specially that all the Prophets from Samuel and those that come after spoke of the days of the Messiah, which at once makes such arguments wholly out of place.

Yet Dr. Donaldson professes to defer to the authority of our Blessed Lord and His Apostles. What must be the unhappy self-deceit of one who can affirm that the only sanction which the Old Testament has from the New, is its general spirit, so far as that agrees with the Gospel; or that by the 'Law' the Book of Deuteronomy only is meant? It is certain, if anything can be certain, that our Lord (followed by His Apostles) set the seal of His Divine sanction on the Holy Scriptures, as they were received by the Jewish Church at that time. What He sanctioned as Divine, was not the general spirit of the Old Testament, but the books themselves. How they came to be what they are—supposing that their authors used, as indeed in many of the books it is allowed that they did use, preexisting materials out of which to construct their works—does not affect the issue. The books are divinely sanctioned. God is said to speak in them—His Holy Spirit to say what they say—with this qualification—that God spake at sundry times and in divers manners; and that according to the times and spiritual condition of His people, He adopted the mode of teaching most suited to their state. The people in their early days, and under the whole of the Old Dispensation, were as children, to whom the elements of truth only were communicated. They were hard of heart, and accordingly precepts were given to them, such as were best suited to their state. As our Lord communicated truth to His own disciples as they were able to hear it, so did Almighty God to His people. Truths were kept back from them: the full splendour of truth was veiled: and their actions were weighed, commended, and blamed with reference to this standard. We have in these principles, which pervade the New Testament from the Sermon on the Mount, where they are most explicitly set forth, through all our Lord's teaching and then through that of His apostles. Here is the true key to the reverence with which the Old Testament is to be viewed, and the authority which it ought to have among those who live under the Christian dispensation. The saints and writings of the Old Testament are to be judged of according to the light and advantages they had: *pro ratione temporum*. But the truth is never to be lost sight of that the

Holy Spirit of God was working among them; and that the prophetic Spirit, through those ancient worthies, foretold things to come: that the writers were in such sense so inspired and directed by God, as to put their works entirely on a different ground from all human compositions.

This we must hold, if we defer to the teaching of Christ. If He died and rose again, if He be a Divine Teacher, if the Gospel be from God, the Old Testament must be regarded as Divine: to be devoutly studied by the light given through the teaching of Christ, and on the principles on which it was studied and is expounded by His apostles. He Himself opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures, and expounded to them in all these Scriptures the things concerning Himself. Their expositions, then, are the Divine explanation of the Old Testament, and must be our key to the right mode of studying and interpreting them.

Then as to the view of the earlier books of the Old Testament being compilations out of various ancient relics, we certainly expected, from Dr. Donaldson's reputation for philological learning and acuteness, that something great would have been done; and, doubtless, those who may not read his book would be disposed to give great weight to his theories from this circumstance. In this point, however, it will be found that he has done nothing. The attempts at arguments of this kind are few, unsystematic, and rash; grounded on positive but often incorrect assertions, and made without any consideration of facts opposed to, and incompatible with, his positions. Such is the argument from *μάχαιρα*, which is put forward as quite a certainty, and is found to be utterly valueless, being a mere conjecture that because two words in two languages are similar, they are the same; when there are many other ways of explaining the fact. On this subject Dr. Donaldson has shown, we think, how little can be done; and to one who carefully examines his book, *looks at the passages referred to*, verifies his statements, weighs his arguments, and, above all, learns to estimate duly his assertions as to the value of these arguments, and as to what he has proved—such an one, we conceive, will rise from the perusal of the work with a conviction that but little can be done in this way. For example: a few verses of the first, and parts of the second and third chapters of Genesis, and of those that follow, are said to be parts of the Book of Jashar, which were old relics put together in the days of Solomon, and that the rest of the book was written after the Captivity. Well, if this were the case, surely the philologist would be able to point out the difference of the language in the composition of periods so widely separated, and

would ground on this—not on his theory of the meaning of the word Jashar—that the one part was more ancient, the other more recent. He does not even attempt to do this.

Indeed, his whole theory is put out with so much of rashness—he is so ready to assume any fact as probable which seems necessary for its defence—that he places himself out of the pale of argument, and it is difficult to know what he admits and what he denies; else one would have thought that the common arguments for the antiquity of the Pentateuch might have deserved consideration; such as its reception as a sacred book by the Samaritans, which would certainly seem to throw it back to a period when the people were one; the indications of the system set forth in it being established during the time of the historical books; the simplicity of its narrations, and their evidently belonging to such a state of society as existed in those ages; the adaptation of the provisions of the law to the condition of the people in their first settlement in the land, and its being difficult of use in later times. Read the provisions of the law of Moses; consider them in their connexion with the institutions of Egypt, and the settlement of the people in Canaan; and then think of Dr. Donaldson's theory that they were composed after the Captivity. They could only have been preserved by being written, and the whole character of the laws, as well as of the history, breathes the spirit of the earliest ages.

This, however, is not the time or the place for a full treatment of so extensive a subject. We can but hint at its topics. One thing, however, we may say, which may be of use to those who are likely to read our pages: that the greatest evils are likely to result from the neglect of an accurate, thoughtful, and devout study of the Old Testament. Such a result might be expected, in the ordinary course of God's dealings, from a neglect of that distinct instruction respecting the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, which is given us by S. Paul:—

‘Καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ βρῆφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν, διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· ἵνα ἁγίως ἢ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρισμένος.’

Such instruction as this cannot be neglected by Christian ministers or people without danger. This *use* of the Old Testament it is which would secure us against the assaults of such writers as those who are now before us. By it we should learn to trace the Divine characteristics which pervade the books—we should see the unity and reality of the characters depicted in them—we should know those ancient saints to be historical, not mythical personages. The Patriarchs, whom our Lord and His

Apostles put before us as models, we should recognise as real persons. We should discern the incidental and undesigned coincidences which prove the reality and truth of their history, which cannot be seen in a mere cursory perusal. The persons and the events would come out as actual and real things, and so lay hold of our convictions and our affections. And though the writings be simple, and belong to a simple age, we should derive spiritual benefit from them, because we should be studying them in faith and with a docile temper, as being in truth the words of God, not of man. Those persons can know nothing of this who do not believe in the testimony of our Lord respecting the Old Testament, and look on its writings as nothing more than the compositions of ignorant men, and who, accordingly, imagine that they obtain more profit from the writings of pious Christians, which have no external authority, nor anything to commend them to our acceptance, beyond their harmonizing with our own notions of what is good and spiritual. Such persons forget that they would probably, on their own principles, learn more of what was good from the writings of Plato than from those of Solomon. Yet, for all this, it is to Moses and Solomon, and not to Plato, that S. Paul directs the studies of Timothy.

- ART. VI.—1. *The Glories of Mary. Translated from the Italian of S. Alphonsus de' Liguori, Founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. By A FATHER OF THE SAME CONGREGATION.* London: Wallwork. 1852.
2. *The Glories of Mary. Translated from the Italian of S. Alphonsus M. Liguori. By A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN.* Dublin: Duffy. 1851.
3. *The Glories of Mary. Translated from the Italian of S. Alphonsus Liguori.* First American Edition. New York: Dunigan. 1854.
4. *El Mes de Maria, ó el mes de Mayo, consagrado á Maria Santísima.* Sevilla. 1850.

To men seriously desirous of learning the exact position which other bodies of men hold in relation to that body to which they themselves belong, nothing is more satisfactory than to receive from the hands of those bodies themselves an authorized exposition of their teaching or constitution. When this has been done the mind is at once relieved from the fear of doing unintentional wrong to the whole body, by attributing to it what may be the eccentricities of individuals, and it enjoys a sense of security from knowing that it has now the means of judging on grounds the fairness of which can be gainsaid by no one. This is the reason why we have thought the works of S. Alfonso de' Liguori so especially valuable. His works, together with every opinion in them, have been so fully approved by the Church of Rome, in the most formal manner possible, that there can be no risk and no unfairness in looking upon him as the special exponent of her morality and her doctrines in the present century. We will not repeat the proofs which show the complete identification of his teaching with her teaching. They will be found at length in the *Christian Remembrancer* for October, 1854. We will only add here, that these proofs might be multiplied indefinitely; for writers who have reproduced S. Alfonso's words or sentiments, such as Scavini and Gaume, naturally enough parade the amount of authority which they have at their disposal, and defy their opponents to disprove it. In vain does the Abbé Laborde writhe under the infliction. In vain does he cry out against 'the strange corruption which this Casuist spreads over all the duties of morality.'¹ In vain does he argue

¹ 'La Croyance à l'Immaculée Conception de la Sainte Vierge ne peut devenir dogme de foi,' p. 18.

that his canonization is void, 'because the theologians who examined his works were themselves full of the maxims of the 'corrupted and corrupting morality contained in his books.'¹ In vain he declares that 'it is a matter of perfect demonstration, 'that had they followed the necessary rules, Alfonso de' Liguori 'never could have been canonized: that it is only because they 'were not followed that he has been; and consequently that 'his canonization has taken place contrary to the rules of the 'Holy See, which in this case are those of religion and reason'—that 'if his doctrine is holy and safe, then the strait way of the 'Gospel has been enlarged, or rather turned aside, and the 'broad and wide way which leads to perdition has been inaugurated *dans la pratique*, and henceforth it is almost idle to look 'for the morals of Christians in Christendom.'² The voice of the Gallican may here and there be heard wailing over the loss of purity, holiness, and righteousness, but the Gallican is no representative of the modern Roman Catholic. His voice is silenced by a command from Rome; his publications are placed on the Index; he is commanded to retract his words; he is threatened with deprivation, disgrace, and want;³ while his triumphant Ultramontane rival floats on with the stream, and dreams of the hat of a cardinal. The following passage, which we take from the preface of the Spanish translation of the Abbé Gaume's work, *El Libro de los Confesores*, represents the almost universal regard in which S. Alfonso is held by his co-religionists:—

'The works of Alfonso de' Liguori were examined according to the utmost rigour of these rules, before they proceeded to his beatification; and the examination was the more careful, because his doctrine was on many points a subject of dispute. And what was the result of the examination? The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, confirmed by Pope Pius VII., will reply. It says that it has discovered *nothing* to be censured in all the different works of the servant of God. They contain no single proposition which is, I will not say, impious, heretical, schismatical, or scandalous, but even erroneous, harmful, or rash. The morals of this holy Bishop cannot be censured without setting up a censor of authority itself, without censuring the decision of the Holy See, which has declared their orthodoxy, and shown that there is in them nothing, absolutely nothing, which is reprehensible. Here we have seven Popes who have approved, eulogized, and recommended the Theology of the blessed Liguori; here is the Church, which places this holy Bishop upon her altars, and recognises his doctrine as having worked prodigies of salvation in souls,' &c.⁴

'What wonder,' cries the Abbé Laborde, 'that those who 'have destroyed the practice of the ancient Morality are occupying themselves, by way of compensation, with the enterprise

¹ La Croyance, &c., p. 19.

² Ibid. p. 21.

³ This is what is occurring at the moment in which we are writing to the Abbé Prompsault, who has ventured publicly to maintain the principles of Bossuet.

⁴ Prélogo, p. xxiv.

‘of introducing a new Faith!’¹ What this new faith is, as it left the hands of S. Alfonso de’ Liguori, we now proceed to investigate. The historical argument against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has been already discussed in our pages,² and we do not intend to reopen it. We repeat, our present purpose is to show what is the real doctrine of the Church of Rome with reference to devotion towards S. Mary, according to the testimony of her own authorized exponent, or rather what it was previous to the immense impulse given to it by the dogmatic declaration that she is exempt from the otherwise universal taint of original sin.

The book to which we are able to refer for this purpose, without fear of being either misled ourselves or misleading others, is the *Glorie di Maria*. The following passage from S. Alfonso’s *Præcis Confessarii* will show the object with which it was written, and the cause of its immense popularity, and will likewise lead us to conjecture how enormous its influence must be throughout the Roman Catholic world:—

‘The parish priest is to be specially watchful to render his sheep earnest in their devotion towards the Virgin Mary, by declaring how powerful and how pitiful this divine Mother is in helping those who are devout towards her. He is therefore to induce them to recite (*insinuet ut recitent*) five decades of the Rosary in common with their family every day, and he is to suggest to them to fast on Saturdays, and to celebrate Novenas on the festivals of our Lady; and these he must give out himself from the altar whenever they occur. It will be highly praiseworthy if he makes a little address every Saturday about the Blessed Virgin, in which he should always narrate some *Example*. And once a year he should celebrate a solemn Novena of our Lady, with a sermon and an exposition of the Holy Sacrament. And for this purpose he can use, among others, the little book called *Glories of Mary*, which I have published on this very account, and in which he will find plenty of materials and of Examples. Happy is that priest who makes his parishioners fervid in their devotion towards the most Blessed Virgin, for they will then lead a good life by her help, and he at his departure hence will have her for his faithful and powerful advocate! He is, moreover, to recommend them above all things to get into the habit of frequently commending themselves to God, by asking holy perseverance of Him, through the merits of Jesus and Mary.’—Cap. x. 216.

In the *Glorie di Maria*, therefore, we have the popular and approved pulpit teaching of Rome on the subject of S. Mary. We have ourselves heard it reproduced in foreign sermons, and it serves as the groundwork of numberless little devotional works, which are issued at the beginning of May each year. Nor is it repudiated in England and Ireland—witness the two following testimonies:—

‘We entirely accept S. Alphonsus as a fair type of the prevalent and living spirit of Catholic devotion towards the Blessed Virgin. We adopt his

¹ La Croyance, &c., p. 22.

² Vide *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1852.

language; we venerate his example; we circulate his writings; we deny that they are disliked by the rich or the educated, or the laity as such.¹

And, again, a Roman Catholic authority, a few months ago, gives us the following 'Outline of the Rev. H. Marshall's Sermon at Clapham, on the Feast of S. Alphonsus,' after the morning sermon had been preached by 'the Bishop of Southwark':—

'Mr. Marshall's discourse was divided into three parts. In the first, he dwelt on the mercies of God, showing for what purposes saints were sent into the world, and that each had his own peculiar work allotted him. After panegyrising other great saints, he came to S. Alphonsus, who, he said, was emphatically *the Saint of modern times*. He spoke of him as the founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, and replied to the arguments of those who preferred the active to the contemplative orders. They know not (said the rev. preacher) from whence many of the graces we continually receive come to us; they think not of the pains in purgatory which are shortened by the prayers of these holy contemplatives, and by the indulgences which they obtain from the mercy of God. He showed how closely S. Alphonsus followed his Divine Master, by seeking out the sinner, and restoring him, by his preaching and his other charitable labours, to the grace which he had forfeited. Our Blessed Lord (said the preacher) shed one drop of His sacred blood upon His holy Mother when standing at the foot of His cross, and another upon the beloved disciple; but upon the sinner, the penitent Magdalene, He poured forth a deluge as she embraced His feet. In the second part of his discourse he spoke of the writings of S. Alphonsus—the sweet effusions in which he seemed to have poured forth his whole soul, and which embraced every subject of Christian meditation and practice. Thus we were instructed on the necessity of prayer and the Sacraments; on devotion to the Sacred Passion, the Holy Eucharist, and the Blessed Virgin, whose praises he preached and published during a long and laborious life, and who rewarded him with many wonderful favours. Your readers are probably aware that a new and much improved English edition of the works of S. Alphonsus is in course of publication by one of the Redemptorist Fathers—a work for which the Bishop of Southwark has obtained the especial blessing of the Holy See. A new translation of the "Glories of Mary" was lately published by Mgr. Weld. A beautiful Litany and Hymn (indulged by the Bishop of Southwark) in honour of S. Alphonsus were used on this feast, and the greatest devotion was manifested on the occasion. The Cardinal Archbishop has frequently preached at Clapham on this feast, and he observed on one occasion, *that there was not a confessional in England which was not, more or less, under the influence of the Saint's mild Theology*. The new translation of the "Glories of Mary" (which may be had of Mr. Wallwork, Great Marlborough-street, Regent-street) is put forth with the Archbishop's approbation, who strongly recommends it to Catholics.'²

It is this highly approved edition which we take as the groundwork of our present article. The book is divided into three parts. The first part consists of a commentary on the *Salve Regina*, ending with 'some devout prayers addressed by various saints to the Divine Mother.' The second consists of nine Discourses on her Immaculate Conception, her Birth, her

¹ Rambler, Nov., 1854.

² Tablet, Aug. 11, 1855.

Presentation, Annunciation, Visitation, Purification, Assumption, and Dolours, together with Reflections on her Dolours and her Virtues, and an enumeration of various practices of devotion in her honour. The third part is composed of miscellaneous examples, meditations, sermons, novenas, rosaries, and prayers. Prefixed is the Translator's Preface, of which the following extract is a sufficient specimen:—

'The name of S. Alphonsus de' Liguori is dear to all Catholics; and the sweet odour of his virtues has been everywhere disseminated by his works, in which the blessed saint has planted them, as in a garden of delights. But in the midst of this garden, beloved reader, one bed of choicest flowers is seen, whose fragrance attracts the traveller from afar; and which, as he approaches, ravishes his soul. It is "love for Mary" which composes the flower-bed of which we speak; for though in this garden flowers of every kind abound, yet "love for Mary" is the rose whose scent has been wafted by the breeze on every side; it is "love for Mary" which more especially adorns the saint's eternal crown, and which has become in a manner identified with himself, so that the very mention of Alphonsus' name recalls the love of Mary to each Christian heart. The cold North wind and the warm and balmy breezes of the South have alike blown through this garden of delights—the cold North wind, I say, which chills devotion in the Church of God, which would induce men to refuse to Mary that love and honour which God himself has given her, and which, under specious pretences of reverence, would at length drive from amongst us her sweet name. Yes, indeed, this wind has blown through the beautiful bed of roses which is now presented to you. . . . But the sweet zephyrs of the South have also blown through this garden, and friendly souls, the true children of Mary, have inhaled these delicious perfumes, and thereby have become as pillars of smoke of aromatical spices, and ascended to the throne of God. Oh, how many have been delivered from hell by this sweet devotion! How many have thus become illustrious in the Christian warfare, and at length have been placed on the altars of the Church! But enough! this sweet flower is now in the reach of all, so that each may, while perusing this little work, enjoy its delicious scent. I will, therefore, only premise a few remarks, which may help to increase the confidence of its readers in all that they will find advanced, as to the greatness and the power of this Mother of God, as also as to her love and tender mercy for us. In a Protestant country, and breathing a Protestant atmosphere, it is difficult to have those tender feelings of love and confidence which all true Catholics should entertain towards Mary; but as the difficulty is great, so also should our efforts be great to obtain and nourish in our souls that tender devotion towards her which is looked upon by the saints and spiritual writers as a pledge of eternal salvation.'—P. iv.

At the end of the Preface we find the usual sentence, which sounds as much like a threat as an assurance: 'Remember, that 'it has been strictly examined by the authority which is 'charged by God Himself to instruct you, and that that 'authority has declared that it contains NOTHING (*sic*) worthy 'of censure.' (P. xviii.) In spite, however, of its entirely unobjectionable nature, the Editor or Censor (Cardinal Wiseman) has thought it necessary to omit two of the Examples; though why others should have been allowed to pass, and these

alone struck out, it passes our comprehension to conceive. Certainly, they are immoral and incredible, but they only share these characteristics with nine-tenths of the other examples. We quote them as they are given in Duffy's edition of the work—an edition which, although it does not omit these two cases, is, in other respects, far more cleverly cooked for the English market, as we shall presently have occasion to point out.

'Our advocate has shown her great mercy towards sinners, in favour of a religious called Beatrix, in the monastery of Fonte Eraldo.—Cæsarius, 1, 7, c. 35, P. Rho. in Ex. This unhappy religious devised a plan of flying off from the convent. She went one day before an image of Mary, and at its feet deposited the keys of the monastery, for she was portress, and left the convent. Having reached a certain town, *she there lived in the miserable state of sin for a considerable time.*¹ She happened one day to meet the agent of the monastery, and believing that in consequence of her change of dress he would not recognise her, she asked him if he knew sister Beatrix? "I know her well," replied the agent; "she is a holy nun, and is at present mistress of novices." At this answer she was confounded and stunned, not knowing how she could be mistress of novices. To ascertain the truth, she put on another dress and went to the monastery. She sent for sister Beatrix; and behold the most holy Virgin appears in the form of the image before which sister Beatrix left the keys and her habit at her departure from the monastery. The Divine Mother then said, "Know that, to prevent your disgrace, I have taken your form, and have performed for you the duties of your office *since your flight from the monastery.*"² My child, return, do penance, my Son still waits for you; and endeavour, by a holy life, to preserve the good name which I have here acquired for you." After these words the Virgin disappeared. Beatrix entered again into the monastery, resumed the religious habit, and, grateful for Mary's great mercy, she lived a saint, and at death disclosed all, to the glory of this great queen.—P. 284.

'Cæsarius relates (lib. 7, Dial. cap. 3) that a Cistercian monk, who was greatly devoted to the Blessed Virgin, desired a visit from his beloved lady, and prayed for it continually. He went one night into the garden; and while he was looking up towards heaven, sending forth ardent sighs to his queen, through a desire of seeing her, behold! he sees a beautiful and luminous virgin descending from on high. She said to him, "Thomas, would you wish to hear me sing?" "Certainly," replied the monk. The virgin sang so sweetly that the devout religious thought he was in Paradise. She disappeared, leaving to him a strong desire to know who she was. Another most beautiful virgin appears and begins to sing. He could not refrain from asking her name. The virgin answered: "The person you saw first was Catherine—I am Agnes; we are both martyrs of Jesus Christ, and have been sent by our Lady to console you. Thank Mary, and prepare to receive a greater favour." She then disappeared. The religious began to entertain greater hopes of seeing his queen. Nor was he disappointed; for soon after he beholds a great light, feels his heart filled with a new joy, and in the midst of that light he sees the Mother of God, surrounded by

¹ This is softened by Mr. Duffy. The American translation, approved by Archbishop Hughes, is, 'She led the miserable life of a prostitute for fifteen years.'—P. 224.

² Substituted in place of 'for the fifteen years that thou hast lived far from the monastery and from God.'—American Edition, p. 225.

angels, and far surpassing in beauty the two virgins who had first appeared. She said to him, "My dear servant and child, I have accepted the service you have rendered to me, and have heard your prayers. You have desired to see me; I wish also to allow you to hear me sing." The most holy Virgin began to sing; and such was the melody and sweetness of her voice, that he lost his senses, and fell prostrate on the ground. The bell rang for matins, the monks assembled; but not seeing Thomas, they went to look for him in his cell, and in other parts of the convent; at length they found him in the garden—he appeared to be dead. The superior commanded him to tell what had happened to him; he instantly recovered his faculties, and through obedience related all the favours of the divine Mother.—P. 345.

We will now extract some of the theological statements contained in the work before us, and point out the manner in which they are enforced. The first title given to S. Mary is that of

'Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King: to her belongs dominion and power over all creatures.'—P. 12.

'She is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice.'—P. 13.

'If Jesus is the Father of souls, Mary is also their Mother. On two occasions, according to the holy Fathers, Mary became our spiritual Mother. The first, according to blessed Albert the Great, was when she merited to conceive in her virginal womb the Son of God. This was revealed by our Lord to S. Gertrude, who was one day reading the above text, and was perplexed, and could not understand how Mary, being only the Mother of Jesus, could be said to have brought forth her first-born. God explained it to her, saying that Jesus was Mary's first-born according to the flesh, but that all mankind were her second-born according to the Spirit. . . . The second occasion on which Mary became our spiritual mother, and brought us forth to the life of grace, was when she offered to the Eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Mount Calvary with such bitter sorrow and suffering.'—P. 23.

'Thus it is that in every engagement with the infernal powers we shall always certainly conquer by having recourse to the Mother of God, who is also our Mother, saying and repeating again and again: "We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God: we fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God!" Oh, how many victories have not the faithful gained over hell by having recourse to Mary with this short but most powerful prayer! Thus it was that that great servant of God, sister Mary, the crucified, of the Order of S. Benedict, always overcame the devils.'—P. 26.

"Since the very tigers," says our most loving Mother Mary, "cannot forget their young, how can I forget to love you, my children?"—P. 30.

'Our Blessed Lady herself revealed to sister Mary the crucified, that the fire of love with which she was inflamed towards God was such, that if the heavens and earth were placed in it, they would be instantly consumed; so that the ardours of the Seraphim, in comparison with it, were but as fresh breezes.'—P. 31.

'Let us love her like a S. Francis Solano, who, maddened as it were (but with holy madness) with love for Mary, would sing before her picture, and accompany himself on a musical instrument, saying that, like worldly lovers, he serenaded his most sweet Queen.'—P. 38.

'Let us love her as so many of her servants have loved her, and who never could do enough to show their love. Father Jerome of Texo, of the Society of Jesus, rejoiced in the name of slave of Mary; and, as a mark of servitude, went often to visit her in some church dedicated in her honour.

On reaching the church, he poured out abundant tears of tenderness and love for Mary; then prostrating, he licked and rubbed the pavement with his tongue and face, kissing it a thousand times, because it was the house of his beloved Lady.—P. 38.

'Mary is the Mother of repentant sinners.'—P. 42.

'When Mary sees a sinner at her feet imploring her mercy, she does not consider the crimes with which he is loaded, but the intention with which he comes; and if this is good, even should he have committed all possible sins, the most loving Mother embraces him, and does not disdain to heal the wounds of his soul.'—P. 45.

'“My God,” she says, “I had two sons—Jesus and man; man took the life of my Jesus on the cross, and now thy justice would condemn the guilty one. O Lord! my Jesus is already dead, have pity on me; and if I have lost the one, do not make me lose the other also!” And most certainly God will not condemn those sinners who have recourse to Mary, and for whom she prays, since He himself commended them to her as her children.’—P. 47.

These passages we have taken almost at random from the first chapter, which is a paraphrase of the words, *Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy!* They are very moderate as compared with what follow, but we have not passed them over, in order that our readers may see the general tone of the book, as well as certain specific statements contained in it. The manner adopted by S. Alfonso for especially enforcing the truth of his doctrines, is that of giving Examples which profess (like the two given above) to be real historical facts, illustrative of the principles which he has been laying down. The scene of this Example, which is to prove that Mary is the mother of repentant sinners, is laid in England.¹ There was, we are told, a young nobleman, named Ernest, who had a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Twice she spoke to him: once from an altar, the second time from an image in a corridor; but as 'he cooled in his devotions towards Mary,' and 'neglected to recommend himself to her,' he fell into sin, fled from his monastery, and ended with being a highwayman and assassin. Just before he was taken by the officers of justice, a young nobleman, whom he was going to murder, was suddenly changed into a bleeding crucifix. Filled with confusion, he set off to his monastery to do penance; but being arrested on the way, he was condemned to be hung, without having even time given him for confession. The rest of the story we will give in S. Alfonso's own words:—

'He recommended himself to Mary, and was thrown from the ladder; but the Blessed Virgin preserved his life, and she herself loosened the rope,

¹ 'In an English city,' say the Redemptorist and Cardinal Wiseman. 'In a certain city in England,' says Mr. Duffy. 'In the city of Ridolf,' says a French edition, published by Gauthier, in Paris, in 1835. 'In Ridolio, a city of England,' say Mr. Dunigan and Archbishop Hughes. The reason why the Redemptorist, the Cardinal, and Mr. Duffy, omitted the name, is clear. Ridolio is not an English sounding name. But is this honest? In a French edition, published at Lyons in 1835, and approved by the Archbishop of Paris, the whole story is left out.

and then addressed him, saying, "Go, return to thy monastery, do penance, and when thou seest a paper in my hands announcing the pardon of thy sins, prepare for death." Ernest returned, related all to his abbot, and did great penance. After many years he saw the paper in the hands of Mary, which announced his pardon; he immediately prepared for death, and in a most holy manner breathed forth his soul.—P. 50.

The next chapter is a comment on the words *Our Life—our Sweetness*, as applied to S. Mary. It opens thus:—

'To understand why the holy Church makes us call Mary our Life, we must know that as the soul gives life to the body, so does Divine grace give life to the soul. . . . To have recourse to Mary is the same thing as to find the grace of God.'—P. 52.

'S. Bridget heard an angel say that the holy prophets rejoiced in knowing that God, *by the humility and purity of Mary*, was to be reconciled with sinners, and to raise those who had offended Him to favour.'—P. 56.

'Mary is our Life because she obtains us the pardon of our sins (p. 52), and also because she obtains us perseverance.'—P. 59.

'We shall obtain the greatest of all graces, perseverance, most certainly, if we always seek it through Mary.'—*Ibid.*

'Blessed Allan was one day assaulted by a violent temptation, and was on the point of yielding, *for he had not recommended himself to Mary*; when this most Blessed Virgin appeared to him, and in order that another time he might remember to invoke her aid, she gave him a blow, saying, "If thou hadst recommended thyself to me, thou wouldest not have run into such danger."—P. 62.

'Bernardine de Busto relates that a bird was taught to say, *Hail, Mary!* A hawk was on the point of seizing it, when the bird cried out *Hail, Mary!* In an instant the hawk fell dead.'—P. 64.

'We, says S. Thomas of Villanova, need only, when tempted by the devil, imitate little chickens which, as soon as they perceive the approach of a bird of prey, run under the wings of their mother for protection. This is exactly what we should do whenever we are assaulted by temptation: we should not stay to reason with it, but immediately fly and place ourselves under the mantle of Mary.'—P. 65.

We may notice here how this metaphor, applied by our Lord to Himself, is transferred from Him to S. Mary.

'Mary renders death sweet to her clients.'—P. 68.

'If at the hour of our death we have only the protection of Mary, what need we fear the whole of our infernal enemies? David, fearing the horrors of death, encouraged himself by placing his reliance in the death of the coming Redeemer, and in the intercession of the Virgin Mother. "For though," he says, "I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, thy rod and thy staff, they have comforted me." Cardinal Hugo, explaining these words of the royal prophet, says that the staff signifies the cross, and the rod is the intercession of Mary; for she is the rod foretold by the prophet Isaias, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root." "This Divine Mother," says S. Peter Damian, "is that powerful rod with which this violence of the infernal enemies is conjured;" and therefore does S. Antoninus encourage us, saying, "*If Mary is for us, who shall be against us?*"—P. 71.

The third chapter enlarges on the words *our Hope*:—

'Mary is the Hope of all.'—P. 79.

'S. Thomas of Villanova repeats the same thing, calling her *our only refuge, help, and asylum*.'—P. 81.

'In the book of Exodus we read that God commanded Moses to make a mercy-seat of the purest gold, because it was thence that he would speak to him: "Thou shalt make also a propitiatory of the purest gold. Thence will I give orders and will speak to thee." S. Andrew of Crete says that "the whole world embraces Mary as being this propitiatory." And commenting upon his words, a pious author exclaims, "Thou, O Mary, art the propitiatory of the whole world!"'—P. 81.

'Mary is the Hope of sinners.'—P. 88.

'In Judæa, in ancient times, there were cities of refuge in which criminals, who fled there for protection, were exempt from the punishments which they had deserved. Now-a-days, these cities are not so numerous; there is *but one*, and *that is Mary*, of whom the Psalmist says, "Glorious things are said of thee, O city of God."—P. 89.

'Blessed Albert the Great says that "God, before the birth of Mary, complained by the mouth of the Prophet Ezekiel, that there was no one to rise up and withhold him from chastising sinners; but that He could find no one, *for this office was reserved for our Blessed Lady, who withholds his arm until he is pacified*."—P. 93.

The following is the example which is specially illustrative of Mary being the hope of sinners:—

'Blessed John Herold, who out of humility called himself the Disciple, relates that there was a married man, who lived at enmity with God. His wife, who was a virtuous woman, being unable to engage him to give up sin, begged him, in the wretched state in which he was, to practise at least the devotion of saluting our Blessed Lady with a "Hail, Mary!" each time that he might pass before her picture. He began to do so. One night this wretched man *was on his way to commit a crime*, when he perceived a light at a distance: he drew near to see what it was, and found that it was a lamp burning before a devout picture of Mary, holding the child Jesus in her arms. He at once, *according to custom*, said the "Hail, Mary!" In the same moment he beheld the Divine infant covered with wounds, from which fresh blood was streaming. Terrified, and at the same time moved to compassion, at this sight, he reflected that it was he who, by his sins, had thus wounded his Redeemer. He burst into tears, *but the Divine infant turned his back to him*. Filled with shame, he appealed to the most Blessed Virgin, saying:—"Mother of mercy, thy Son rejects me. I can find no advocate more compassionate and more powerful than thee, for thou art his Mother; my Queen, do thou help me, and intercede for me." The Divine Mother, speaking from the picture, replied, "You sinners call me Mother of Mercy, but, at the same time, you cease not to make me a Mother of Sorrows, by crucifying my Son afresh, and renewing my sorrows." But, as Mary can never let any one leave her feet disconsolate, she began to implore her Son to pardon this miserable wretch. *Jesus continued to show himself unwilling to do so*. The most Blessed Virgin, seeing this, placed him in the niche, and, prostrating herself before him, said: "My Son, I will not leave thy feet until thou hast pardoned this sinner." "My Mother," then said Jesus, "I can deny thee nothing; thou wiltst that he should be forgiven; for love of thee I pardon him; make him come and kiss my wounds." The sinner, sobbing and weeping, did so; and as he kissed them, the wounds were healed. Jesus then embraced him, as a mark of forgiveness, and he changed his life, which, from that time, was one of holiness; and he always preserved the most tender love and grati-

tude towards this Blessed Virgin, who had obtained him so great a grace.'—P. 98.

We would beg our readers to observe, that the person here described merely practised an external devotion without being devout, and simply said his *Hail, Mary!* from custom, while determined on sin. Yet all these miracles—miracles far more startling than any mentioned in the New Testament—were vouchsafed him.

Next we come to a paraphrase on the words, 'To thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve:'—

'Blessed is he who in the midst of these sorrows often turns to the *Comfortress of the world*, to the refuge of the unfortunate, to the great Mother of God, and devoutly calls upon her and invokes her.'—P. 100.

'S. Anselm, to increase our confidence, adds, that "when we have recourse to the Divine Mother, not only we may be sure of her protection, but that *often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved if we have recourse to Mary, and call on her holy name, than we should be if we called on the name of Jesus our Saviour*;" and the reason he gives for it is, "that to Jesus as a *Judge* it belongs also to punish, but mercy alone belongs to the Blessed Virgin as a *Patroness*."—P. 106.

It is scarcely necessary to say, that S. Anselm never said this. The words are taken from a spurious treatise, which every theologian knows that S. Anselm did not write.

"Many things," says Nicephorus, "are asked from God, and are not granted: they are asked from Mary, and are obtained."—P. 106.

Thus we see that prayer to God the Father and God the Son are alike superseded.

'Not only is the most Blessed Virgin Queen of Heaven and of all Saints, but she is also Queen of Hell and of all evil Spirits: for she overcame them valiantly *by her virtues*. From the very beginning God foretold the victory and empire that our Queen would one day obtain over the serpent, when he announced that a woman should one day come into the world to conquer him. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman—*she shall crush thy head*." And who could this woman, his enemy, be but Mary, who, *by her fair humility and holy life*, always conquered him and beat down his strength.'—P. 110.

'It is said in the Old Testament that God guided his people from Egypt to the land of promise: "by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire." This stupendous pillar, at times as a cloud, at others as fire, says Richard of S. Lawrence, was a figure of S. Mary, fulfilling the double office she constantly exercises for our good. As a cloud, she protects us from the ardour of Divine Justice; and as fire, she protects us from the devil.'—P. 115.

Our readers need not be reminded, that in the cloud the Doctors of the Church have seen the presence, not of Mary, but of the Holy Spirit.

'S. Bernard declares, that "in the name of Mary every knee bows: and that the devils not only fear, but tremble at the very sound of her name."—P. 116.

S. Bernard was not guilty of thus travestying the words applied by S. Paul to our Lord. We may conclude that the words are spurious, as the Editor of S. Alfonso acknowledges that he cannot find them.

'Blessed Allan remarks, "At the very sound of these words *Hail, Mary!* Satan flies and Hell trembles."—P. 117.

In the fifth chapter we come to some more startling assertions. It is headed thus, 'Of the Necessity of the Intercession of Mary for our Salvation.'

'S. Lawrence Justinian asks, "How can she be otherwise than full of grace who has been made the *Ladder to Paradise, the Gate of Heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and Man?*"—P. 121.

'That which we intend to prove here is that the intercession of Mary is now necessary to salvation: we say necessary—not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that He dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of S. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of the theologians and learned men. The author of *The Reign of Mary* positively asserts that such is the case. It is maintained by Vega, Mendoza, Pacciuchelli, Segnori, Poiré, Crasset, and by innumerable other learned authors.'—P. 122.

This doctrine, then, is nearly ripe for a dogmatic decree.

'We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of Justice according to the distinction just made, and that by his merits He obtains us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of Grace; and that receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same, whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession.'—P. 124.

Our readers will recollect what marvels were wrought with the rod of *Distinguendum*, in S. Alfonso's *Theologia Moralis*; and they will remember who first invented 'those clever but wholly arbitrary distinctions,' which have been the main argumentative support of the Papal doctrine and discipline.

'In the office appointed to be said on the Feasts of Mary, the Holy Church applying the words of Ecclesiasticus to this Blessed Virgin, gives us to understand that in her we find *all hope*: "In me is all hope of life and virtue." In Mary is every grace: "In me is all grace of the Way and of the Truth." In Mary, finally, we shall find life and eternal salvation: "Who finds me, finds life, and draws salvation from the Lord." And elsewhere, "They that work by me, shall not sin: they that explain me, shall have everlasting life."—P. 125.

'S. Bonaventure says, that Mary is called the Gate of Heaven, because *no one can enter that blessed kingdom without passing by her*.'—P. 127.

'S. Bernardine of Sienna says, "that all graces of the spiritual life that descend from Christ, their head, to the faithful who are his mystical body, are transmitted by the means of Mary."—*Ibid*.

'S. Bernardine says, that for this reason "*all gifts, all virtues, all graces are dispensed by the hands of Mary, to whomsoever, when, and as she pleases*."—P. 128.

'"Address yourselves to the Blessed Virgin," says the venerable Abbot of Celles, "for by her, and in her, and with her, and from her the world receives and is to receive every good."—P. 128.

'It must be now evident to all, that when these Saints and authors tell us in such terms that all graces come to us through Mary, *they do not simply mean to say that "we received Jesus Christ, the source of every good, through Mary,"* as the before-named writer pretends; but that they assure us that God, who gave us Jesus Christ, wills that all graces that have been, that are, and will be dispensed to men, to the end of the world, through the merits of Christ, should be dispensed by the hands and through the intercession of Mary.'—P. 129.

This portion of the 'new faith' is enforced by the following Example:—

'Belluacensis and Cæsarius relate, that there was a certain noble youth who had reduced himself by his vices from a state of opulence, in which he had been left by his father, to one of such poverty, that he was obliged to beg his bread. He left his country, that he might be able to live with less shame in a place where he was unknown. On his road, he one day met a man who had formerly been his father's servant. This man, seeing him in such affliction, on account of the distress into which he had fallen, told him to be of good heart, for he would take him to a prince who was so liberal, that he would be provided with all he could desire. This abandoned wretch was a sorcerer; and one day he led the poor youth to a wood, near a lake, and began to address an invisible person. The youth asked him to whom he was speaking? He replied, "To the devil;" but seeing that the young man was alarmed, he encouraged him, and told him to fear nothing; and then continued to address the evil spirit, and said: "Master, this young man is reduced to the greatest poverty; he would wish to be reinstated in his possessions." "If he will obey me," replied the fiend, "I will make him richer than ever; but, in the first place, he must renounce God." This horrified the young man; but being incited to it by that cursed magician, he complied and renounced his God. "But that is not enough," added the devil; "he must also renounce Mary, for to her we are indebted for our greatest losses. Oh, how many does she not snatch from our hands and lead them back to God, and save." "Oh no," answered the youth, "that I will never do; deny my Mother indeed! She is all my hope; rather would I go begging all my life long;" and, so saying, he left the spot. On his return, he passed by a church dedicated to Mary. The afflicted youth entered, and cast himself on his knees before her image, and began to weep and implore her to obtain him the pardon of his sins. He had scarcely done so, when Mary began to intercede with her Son for the poor wretch. Jesus at first replied: "But, Mother, this ungrateful soul has denied me." But on seeing that his Mother did not cease to pray, he said finally, "O Mother, I never denied thee anything; he is forgiven, since thou askest it." The person who had purchased all the property of the young spendthrift was concealed in the chapel, and heard all that passed, and witnessed the compassion of Mary towards this sinner. He had an only daughter, and determined to give her to the young man in marriage, and make him heir of all he possessed. And thus did this youth recover both the grace of God and his temporal possessions, by the means of Mary.'—P. 130.

We stated above, that Mr. Duffy's edition of the *Glories of Mary* was more cleverly cooked for the English taste than that of the Redemptorist Father, notwithstanding the omission by the latter of two of S. Alfonso's tales, as well as some other alterations. The word may have seemed harsh—we will now take occasion to justify it, remarking, by the way, that the Redemptorist's edition is as superior in its

cooking to the American edition, as Mr. Duffy's is to the Redemptorist's. In the story given above, it will be seen that S. Alfonso represents the young man as denying God, but starting back with horror at the thought of denying Mary. Mr. Duffy's is a controversial edition, full of notes, explaining and justifying the assertions made by the author. How, then, does he deal with this awkward statement? His course is to omit it. There was no other English translation of the book at that time in being; and as few were likely to look into the original, it was not probable that it would be found out. All the words which we have placed in italics are omitted: nor is he content with omissions. In place of the words "Oh no," answered the youth, "that I will never do; deny my Mother indeed! She is all my hope," Mr. Duffy has substituted, 'The young man refused to comply, saying, "I cannot deny my Mother; she is my only hope *after God.*"' And in order that the tampering might not be betrayed, he has been compelled to change 'But, Mother, this ungrateful soul *has denied me,*' into 'My Mother, this ungrateful sinner *has renounced my service.*' Mr. Duffy has played these tricks all through his edition. Thus in the very next page succeeding to the above Example, there is, as usual, one of S. Alfonso's ordinary prayers to S. Mary. The words inserted by Mr. Duffy we will place in brackets.

'I know that it is thy sole goodness which has impelled thee [to procure for me so many benefits.—*Duffy.*] Ah! too little would it be in comparison with what I owe thee, did I shed my blood and give my life for thee; for thou hast delivered me from eternal death: thou hast enabled me, as I hope, to recover Divine grace: to thee, in fine, I owe all I have. [I acknowledge to have received all the good which has come to me *from God.*—*Duffy.*] My most amiable lady, I, a poor wretch that I am, can make thee no return but that of always loving and praising thee. Ah! do not disdain to accept the tender affection of a poor sinner who is inflamed with love for thy goodness! If my heart is unworthy to love thee because it is impure and filled with earthly affections, it is thou who must change it. Ah! change it then! [by thy prayers.—*Duffy.*]'—P. 132.

We shall point out a few more of Mr. Duffy's insertions and omissions as we go along, but shall not go out of our way for the purpose. The above will show what trust can be placed in the fidelity of his edition, and the conscientiousness of the editor.¹

S. Alfonso returns with renewed vigour to his thesis, that the intercession of Mary is necessary for our salvation.

'Blessed Albert the Great calls Mary the "Helper of the Redemption," and the Blessed Virgin herself revealed to S. Bridget, that "as Adam and Eve sold the world for an apple, *so did she with her Son redeem it,* as it were, with one heart."'—P. 133.

¹ We use the phrase, 'Mr. Duffy's edition,' to indicate the edition published by him. The Editor has not given his name, but calls himself 'a Catholic Clergyman.'

'Mary is called the co-operator in our justification, for to her God has entrusted all graces intended for us.'—*Ibid.*

'Richard of S. Lawrence says, as often as we see ourselves in danger of perishing in the midst of temptations and contending passions of this life, let us have recourse to Mary, and cry out quickly, O Lady! help us, save us, if thou wilt not see us perish.'—P. 135.

Again, as usual, words which S. Peter addressed to our Lord are applied to S. Mary,—

'Shall we scruple to ask her to save us when "the way of salvation is open to none otherwise than through Mary," as a certain author remarks.'—P. 135.

'As Pharaoh said to Joseph, "The land of Egypt is in thy hands," and addressed all who came to him for food to Joseph, "Go to Joseph," so does God send us to Mary when we seek for grace: "*Go to Mary.*"'—P. 136.

'Cassian says, absolutely, "that the salvation of all depends on their being favoured and protected by Mary." He who is protected by Mary will be saved; he who is not will be lost.'—*Ibid.*

Towards the end of this chapter, S. Alfonso enters into a short dissertation, to show that it is probable that all the other saints do not intercede directly with God, but with Mary. 'What difficulty can there be in saying, that God in order to 'honour His mother, and having made her Queen of Saints, 'and willing that all grace shall be dispensed by her hands, 'should also will that the saints should address themselves to 'her to obtain favours for their clients?' Here we see the germ of a development which may end in transferring prayers from S. Mary to some other saint, such as S. Joseph, just as at present they are transferred from her Son to her.

The sixth chapter consists of three sections, which are respectively headed 'Mary is an Advocate who is able to save all,' (where Mr. Duffy substitutes, 'to obtain salvation for all through the merits of her Son,') 'Mary is so tender an Advocate that she does not refuse to defend the cause even of the 'most miserable,' and 'Mary is the Peace-maker between 'sinners and God.'

'S. Peter Damian addresses her in these words: "All power is given to thee in heaven and on earth, and nothing is impossible to thee, who canst raise those who are in despair to the hope of salvation."—P. 145.

"At the command of Mary all obey, even God." S. Bernardine fears not to utter this sentence, meaning, indeed, to say, that God grants the prayers of Mary as if they were commands.¹ And hence, S. Anselm, [the treatise referred to is forged,] addressing Mary, says, "Our Lord, O most holy Virgin, has exalted thee to such a degree, that by His favour, all things that are possible to him should be possible to thee." "For thy protection is omnipotent, O Mary," says Cosmas of Jerusalem. "Yes,

¹ Translated in the American edition: 'S. Bernardine of Sienna does not hesitate to say, that all obey the commands of Mary, even God himself, signifying by these words, that God listens to her prayers as though they were commands.' The Latin is *Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, etiam Deus.*

Mary is omnipotent," repeats Richard of S. Lawrence: "for the Queen, by every law, enjoys the same privileges as the King." "And as," he adds, "the power of the Son and that of the mother is the same, a mother is made omnipotent by an omnipotent Son." "And thus," says S. Antoninus, "God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but even under the dominion of Mary."—P. 146.

'Blessed Albert the Great makes Mary say: "I have to be asked that I may will; for if I will a thing, it is necessarily done."—P. 147.

'Mary has only to speak, and her Son executes all.'—P. 149.

'S. Antoninus says, that the prayers of the Blessed Virgin being the prayers of a mother, have in them something of a *command*, so that it is impossible that she should not obtain what she asks.'—P. 151.

'S. George, Abp. of Nicomedia, says that Jesus Christ, even as it were to satisfy an obligation under which He placed Himself towards His mother, when she consented to give Him his human nature, grants all she asks. "The son, as if paying a debt, grants all thy petitions."—P. 152.

The ensuing example seems to be the last over again, with a few alterations made in it. We shall again mark Mr. Duffy's insertions and omissions.

'Father Razzi, of the Camaldolese Order, relates that a young man of the name of John, on the death of his father, was sent by his mother to the court of a prince. His mother, who had a tender devotion towards Mary, before bidding him farewell, made him promise that he would every day say the "Hail, Mary!" adding at the end of it these words: "O most Blessed Virgin, help me at the hour of my death." After having been at court for a short time, he became so dissolute that his master was obliged to dismiss him. No longer knowing how to obtain a living, in despair he became a highway robber and murderer; but during this time even, he never neglected to recommend himself to our Blessed Lady, according to his promise. At length he was taken and condemned to death. When in prison, and the day before his death, reflecting on his own shame, on the grief of his mother, and on the death he was about to endure, he wept bitterly; and thus the devil seeing him disconsolate and filled with melancholy thoughts, appeared to him under the form of a handsome youth, and told him that he would deliver him from prison and death if only he would obey him. The culprit said, he was ready to do all he might ask. The youth then told him that he was the devil come to aid him. *In the first place, he required that he should deny Jesus Christ and the most holy sacraments. To this he consented.*¹ He then demanded that he should renounce the Blessed Virgin Mary and her protection. "Ah, that I will never do!" answered the young man; and, raising his heart to her, he repeated his accustomed prayer, "O Blessed Virgin, help me at the hour of my death." At these words the devil disappeared. The young man was immediately filled with the most bitter grief *for the crime he had committed in denying Jesus Christ*;² but having recourse to the most Blessed Virgin, she obtained him true sorrow for all his sins, and he confessed them with great sighs and contrition. On leaving the jail to go to the scaffold, he passed on the road a statue of Mary, and saluted it with his ordinary prayer, "O most Blessed Virgin, help me at the hour of my death;" and the statue returned his salutation in the presence of all by bowing its head. Moved with tenderness, he begged leave to kiss the feet of the statue. The guard refused, but at length consented, on account of the acclamations of the people.

¹ Omitted by Mr. Duffy.

² 'On account of his sins' is substituted by Mr. Duffy.

The youth stooped to kiss the feet, when Mary extended her arm, took him by the hand, and held him so tight that it was impossible to remove him. At the sight of such a prodigy all began to cry out, "Mercy, pardon, forgiveness;" and it was granted. The young man returned to his own country, and led a most exemplary life, and always filled with the most tender affection for Mary, *who had delivered him* from both temporal and eternal death.—P. 153.

Thus the direct cause of the salvation of this youth and of the young nobleman before mentioned is, that they had a love for the creature which was greater than that which they had for God and for Jesus Christ.

'With good reason, then, does Denis the Carthusian call the Blessed Virgin the singular refuge of the lost, the hope of the most abandoned, and the advocate of all sinners who have recourse to her.'—P. 156.

"Be comforted, then, O you who fear," will I say with S. Thomas of Villanova; "breathe freely and take courage, O wretched sinners. This great Virgin, who is the mother of your God and Judge, is also the advocate of the whole human race: fit for this office, for she can do what she wills with God; most wise, for she knows all the means of appeasing Him; universal, for she welcomes all, and refuses to defend no one."—P. 161.

'O my own beloved Mother, if by thee I save my soul, as I hope to do, I shall no longer be ungrateful. I shall make up for my past ingratitude, and for the love thou hast shown me, by my everlasting praises and all the affections of my soul. Happy in heaven where thou reignest, and wilt reign for ever, I shall always sing thy mercies, and kiss for eternity those loving hands, which have delivered me from hell as often as I have deserved it by my sins. O Mary, my liberator, my hope, my queen, my advocate, my own sweet mother, I love thee, I desire thy glory, and I will love thee for ever. Amen, amen! Thus do I hope.'—P. 163.

Ten pages are devoted to showing that Mary is the Peace-maker between sinners and God. She is the Dove of Noah's Ark, the rainbow round the Throne of God, the Moon. Her 'chief office, on being placed in this world,' was 'to raise up souls that had fallen from Divine grace, and to reconcile them with God' (p. 167). Among a number of spurious passages from S. Chrysostom, S. Anselm, and others, occurs the following quotation from Cardinal Hugo, which is an average specimen of these ten pages:—

"Mary is the great Peace-maker, who finds and obtains the reconciliation of enemies with God, salvation for those who are lost, pardon for sinners, and mercy for those who are in despair."—P. 165.

Next we come to a paraphrase of the words, 'Turn thou thine eyes of mercy towards us.' We will give three passages, as specimens of the rest.

'It was revealed to S. Gertrude that when these words are addressed with devotion to the most Blessed Virgin, "Turn thou, O most gracious

¹ 'By whose prayers, presented in the name of her Son, he was delivered,' substitutes Mr. Duffy.

Advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us," Mary cannot do otherwise than yield to the demands of whoever thus invokes her.'—P. 178.

'The prophet Isaias foretold that, together with the great work of the redemption of the human race, a throne of Divine mercy was to be prepared for us poor creatures: "And a throne shall be prepared in mercy." What is this throne? S. Bonaventure answers, "*Mary is this throne*, at which all, just and sinners, find consolations of mercy." He then adds, "For as we have a most merciful Lord, so we have a most merciful Lady. Our Lord is plenteous in mercy to all who call upon Him, and our Lady is plenteous in mercy to all who call upon her."—*Ibid.*

'The Abbot Guarrie thus addresses the Mother in the name of Jesus Christ: "My Mother, in thee will I establish the seat of my government; through thee will I pronounce judgments, hear prayers, and grant the graces asked of me. Thou hast given me my human nature, and *I will give thee my Divine nature*, that is, Omnipotence, by which thou mayest be able to help to save all whomsoever thou pleasest,"—P. 179.

We add the Example:—

'In the chronicles of the Capuchin fathers it is related, that in Venice there was a famous lawyer, who, by fraudulent dealings and bad practices, became rich, so that he lived in a state of sin. The daily recitation of a particular prayer to the Blessed Virgin was probably the only good thing that he ever did. *And yet this slight devotion obtained him, through the mercy of Mary, deliverance from eternal death.* It was thus. He, happily for himself, took an affection for Father Mathew de Basso, and entreated him so often to come and dine at his house, that at length this good father complied with his request. When he got to the house, the lawyer said, "Now, father, I will show you a thing you never saw before. I have a most extraordinary monkey, who serves me as a valet, washes the glasses, lays the table, and opens the door for me." "Ah," replied the father, "take care: perhaps it is not a monkey, but something more; bring it here." They call again and again for the monkey, but no monkey appears; they seek for it everywhere, but it is not to be found. At length they discovered it concealed under a bed, in a lower part of the house; but no, the monkey would not come out. "Well, then," said the religious, "let us go to it;" and when the lawyer and he reached the place where it was, the father cried out, "Infernal beast, come forth, and on the part of God I command thee to say what thou art." The monkey replied, "that he was the devil, and that he was only waiting for that sinner to omit for a single day his ordinary prayer to the Mother of God; for, the first time he omitted it, he had permission from God to strangle him, and carry him to hell." On hearing this, the poor lawyer cast himself on his knees to ask for help from the servant of God, who encouraged him, and commanded the devil to leave the house without doing mischief. "Only," said he, "I permit thee to make a hole in the wall of the house, as a sign of thy departure." He had scarcely said the words than, with a tremendous noise, a hole was made in the wall, and which, though often closed with mortar and stone, God permitted should remain open for a long time, until at length the servant of God advised that it should be covered with a marble slab, with the figure of an angel on it. The lawyer was converted, and, as we hope, persevered until death in his change of life.'—P. 181.

As he advances, our author grows more bold and enthusiastic. The next chapter is divided into three sections, which are thus headed: 'Mary delivers her Clients from Hell—Mary suc-

'cours her Clients in Purgatory—Mary leads her Servants to 'Heaven.' It begins with the following sentence: 'It is impossible for a client of Mary who is faithful in honouring and recommending himself to her, to be lost.' Having made this statement, S. Alfonso begs his readers to know that 'it is to be understood of those clients who, with a sincere desire to amend, are faithful in honouring and recommending themselves to the 'Mother of God.' On which we might ask—first, why this necessary condition of repentance is not stated at once? and next, why he has confirmed his original proposition with further statements and tales, in which there is no mention whatever of repentance, and which must lead simple, childlike minds to the belief that repentance is not necessary? To make out his point, S. Alfonso first declares that 'he will examine what other saints and learned men have said on the subject.' Accordingly he appeals—1st, to S. Anselm; the passage which he quotes is forged. 2d, to S. Antoninus, from whose words he concludes, 'consequently the clients of Mary will necessarily be saved.' 3d, to Blessed Albert, who says that 'all those who are not thy servants, O Mary, will perish.' 4th, to S. Bonaventure, who says, 'that not only those from whom Mary turns her face will not be saved, but that there will be no hope of their salvation.' He then claims S. Ignatius the Martyr and S. Chrysostom, in the following words:—

'Before him, S. Ignatius the Martyr said, "that it was impossible for any sinner to be saved without the help and favour of the most Blessed Virgin; because those who are not saved by the justice of God are, with infinite mercy, saved by the intercession of Mary." Some doubt as to whether this passage is truly of S. Ignatius; but, at all events, as Father Crasset remarks, it was adopted by S. John Chrysostom. It is also repeated by the venerable Raymond Jordano."—P. 185.

Again, three pages lower:—

"No," says S. Ignatius the Martyr, "he who is devout to the Virgin Mother will certainly never be lost."—P. 188.

There is something very perplexing in this: not in finding such an authority for such doctrine, because none of our readers will require to be informed that the passages are forgeries, and are not found in any works of S. Ignatius or of S. Chrysostom, nor, to the best of our knowledge, in any writings attributed at any time by any person to S. Ignatius or S. Chrysostom, previous to the time of the Jesuit De Celada, in the appendix to whose commentary on Judith, written in the year 1537, after the waste of much labour, we at length found it. But it is perplexing to find that a man of devout mind, writing in behalf of religion, can so entirely divest his mind of the obligation of speaking the truth with regard to historical facts. Whether the venerable

Raymond Jordano has repeated it or not we do not know: this venerable abbot, who lived at the end of the fourteenth century, 'out of humility,' we are told, 'surnamed himself *The Idiot*' (p. 235).

The following is one of the methods by which Mary delivers her clients from Hell:—

'It is the opinion of many theologians, and of S. Thomas in particular, that for many who have died in mortal sin the Divine Mother has obtained from God a suspension of their sentence, and a return to life to do penance. Trustworthy authors give us many instances in which this has occurred. Amongst others, Flodoardus, who lived about the ninth century, relates in his *Chronicles*, that a certain deacon named Adelman, who was apparently dead and was being buried, returned to life and said, "that he had seen hell to which he was condemned, but that at the prayers of the Blessed Virgin he had been sent back to this world to do penance."—P. 188.

'Pelbertus says that in his time, when the Emperor Sigismund was crossing the Alps with his army, a voice was heard coming from a skeleton, asking for a confession, and declaring that the Mother of God, for whom he had a tender devotion when a soldier, had obtained that he should thus live until he had been able to make his confession; and having done so, the soul departed.'—P. 189.

'Blessed Henry Suso used to say, "that he had placed his soul in the hands of Mary, and that if he was condemned, the sentence must pass through her hands;" being confident that if he was in such hands, this tender Virgin would certainly prevent its execution. The same do I hope for myself, O my own most holy Queen; and therefore I will always repeat the words of S. Bonaventure: "In thee, O Lady, [after *Jesus ins. Duffy.*] have I placed all my hopes; and thus I confidently trust that I shall never be lost, but praise and love thee for ever in heaven."—P. 190.

Some, perhaps, among our readers, who remember their ministrations to dying penitents, will recollect that the language, or, if not the words, the feelings, of those who after an ungodly life have been turned by the blessing of God to better ways and penitential lives, are 'I am a great sinner; but if I perish, I perish at the foot of Christ's cross, where never sinner perished yet.' For this godly sorrow and self-distrusting hope, are we to substitute such thoughts as the teaching of Blessed H. Suso and S. Alfonso would suggest—'I have committed myself to Mary, I have placed my soul in her hands, and, with so merciful a mediatrix and protectress, I cannot but be saved?'

In the following Example we beg our readers to observe that there is not the smallest hint of the necessity of amendment or penitence. The two persons spoken of are equally criminal and sinful, but one is hurried to everlasting hell-fire because he did not, and the other is saved alive on earth because he did, recite some *Hail, Marys* 'without devotion and half asleep.'

'In the year 1604, in a city of Flanders, there were two young men, students, but who, instead of attending to their studies, gave themselves up to a life of debauchery. One night they were both in a house with an evil companion, when one of them, named Richard, returned home, leaving

his companion there. After he got home, and had begun to undress, he remembered he had not that day said some "Hail, Marys" that he was in the habit of reciting. Feeling very sleepy, he was loath to say them; he did himself violence, and repeated them, *though without devotion and half asleep*. He then laid down, and had fallen into a sound slumber, when he was suddenly roused by a violent knocking at the door, and without its opening, he saw his companion, deformed and hideous, standing before him. "Who art thou?" he cried out. "What! dost thou not know me?" "Ah! yes, but how thou art changed! Thou seemest to me a devil." "Truly," he exclaimed, "poor unfortunate creature that I am! I am damned; and how? When I was leaving that wicked house, a devil came and strangled me; my body is in the street, and my soul in hell;¹ and thou must know," added he, "that the same fate awaited thee *had not the blessed Virgin preserved thee in consideration of that little act of homage of the 'Hail, Mary.'*" Fortunate art thou if only thou knowest how to take advantage of this warning sent thee by the Mother of God!" With these words he opened his mantle, and showing the flames and serpents by which he was tormented, he disappeared. Richard immediately burst into sobs and tears, and casting himself prostrate on the ground, he returned thanks to Mary, his protectress; and whilst thinking how to change his life, he heard the bell of the Franciscan Monastery ringing for matins. "Ah! it is there," says he, "that God calls me to do penance." He went straight off to the convent, and implored the fathers to admit him. But they were hardly willing to do so, knowing his wicked life; but he sobbing bitterly, told all that had taken place; and two fathers being sent to the street, and having found the strangled body, which was as black as a coal, they admitted him. From that time forward Richard led a most exemplary life, and at length went to preach the Gospel in the Indies, and thence to Japan, where he had the happiness of giving his life for Jesus Christ, being burnt alive for the faith.—P. 191.

On the succour given by Mary to the souls in Purgatory, S. Alfonso does not give us so many particulars as Mr. F. Faber, who is adding several pious opinions on the subject to the stock of the general belief, such as that S. Mary is 'Empress' and S. Michael 'Prince of Purgatory and our Lady's Regent';² but our author tells us a great deal.

'Mary not only consoles and relieves her clients in Purgatory, but she delivers them by her prayers. Gerson says, "that on the day of her assumption into heaven Purgatory was entirely emptied." Novarinus con-

¹ 'Look at the saint's story about those two young reprobates who went to the bad house; one of them goes home to bed, then the other comes to him, and what does he say? Why, he says, "My body is lying dead in the street," says he, "and my soul is away in hell," says he, "and here I am myself," says he. Now, your honour, who was he, or what was he at all? He wasn't his body, for that was in the street; he wasn't his soul, for that was in hell: and is there anything else in a man to make himself? so who was he at all?'—Letter of Pat Murray to the Catholic Layman, April, 1855. The learning and temper of this periodical are most commendable.

² 'All for Jesus,' pp. 8 and 376. The following passage, too, is remarkable: 'Some of our writers have said that our Lord will not help them (the souls in Purgatory) without our cooperation; and that our Blessed Lady cannot help them, except in indirect ways, because she is no longer able to make satisfaction, though I never like to hear of anything our dearest Mother cannot do,' p. 368. A little above (p. 350) Mr. Faber had spoken of Jesus' 'helplessness with regard to his dear spouses in Purgatory' as 'beautiful'; but he is shocked at the supposition of S. Mary being helpless.

firms this, saying, that "it is maintained by many grave authors, that when Mary was going to heaven, she asked, as a favour from her Son, to take all the souls then in Purgatory with her." "And from that time forward," says Gerson, "Mary had the privilege of delivering her servants." S. Bernardine of Sienna also positively asserts, "that the Blessed Virgin has the power of delivering souls from Purgatory, but particularly those of her clients, by her prayers, and by applying her merits for them. Novarinus says, that by the merits of Mary, not only are the pains of those souls lessened, but the time of their suffering is shortened through her intercession. She has only to ask, and all is done."—P. 195.

The last words are a gloss upon *ope Virginis*. It is her merits, not her intercession, that the author is regarding. Intercession is, unfortunately, an ambiguous word, sometimes meaning prayer, sometimes intervention.

'The promise made by our Blessed Lady to Pope John XXII. is well known. She appeared to him and ordered him to make known to all, that on the Saturday after their death she would deliver from Purgatory all who wore the Carmelite Scapular. This, as Father Crasset relates, was proclaimed by the same Pontiff in a Bull, which was afterwards confirmed by Alexander V., Clement VII., Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Paul V.; and this latter, in a Bull of the year 1612, says "that Christian people may piously believe that the Blessed Virgin will help them after death by her continual intercession, her merits, and special protection; and that on Saturdays, the day consecrated by the Church to her, she will in a more particular manner help the souls of the brethren of the confraternity of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel, who have departed this life in a state of grace, provided they have worn the habit, observed the chastity of their state, and recited her office; or if they could not recite it, if they have observed the fasts of the Church, and abstained from meat on all Wednesdays, except Christmas Day."—P. 196.

There is a great deal more about the advantages of this Scapular at a later part of the book. We extract one passage:—

'Modern heretics, as usual, ridicule this devotion; but the holy Church has approved it by many bulls and indulgences. Father Crasset and Lezana, speaking of the Scapular of Mount Carmel, relate that towards the year 1251 the Blessed Virgin appeared to S. Simon Stock, an Englishman, and giving him the Scapular, said, that all who should wear it would be saved from eternal damnation. She said, "Receive, my beloved son, this Scapular of thy order, the badge of my confraternity, a privilege granted to thee and to all Carmelites; whoever dies clothed with it will not suffer eternal flames."—P. 485.

By way of example to others, S. Alfonso says that he wears himself the Scapular of Mount Carmel, the Scapular of Mary in sorrow, the Scapular of Mary of Mercy, and particularly the Scapular of the Conception. In this place Mr. Duffy has been more honest in his translation than the Redemptorist Father and Cardinal Wiseman; for the former tells us that 'the Indulgences granted to any religious order, pious place, or to any person, are annexed to the Scapular of the Immaculate Conception, which is blessed by the Theatines; and by reciting a

'*Pater, Ave, and Gloria* six times in honour of the most holy Trinity and Immaculate Mary, we can gain (*toties quoties*) each time all the Indulgences of Rome, of Portiuncula, of Jerusalem, and Galitia' (p. 335), which the Redemptorist Father and Cardinal Wiseman pare down into 'very great Indulgences.' Mr. Duffy is, in turn, convicted by Mr. Dunigan of having omitted the number of these Indulgences; they are 'four hundred and thirty-three Plenary Indulgences, beside the temporal, which are innumerable' (p. 661).

The example given to exhibit the power of Mary over Purgatory would, perhaps, equally as well show her influence in saving her clients from hell. It tells how one Alexandra was killed while in mortal sin, and her head thrown into a well; how, some days afterwards, S. Dominic was passing by, and the head came to the edge of the well and begged him to hear its confession, which he accordingly did, and gave it the communion; after which it stayed for two days to be looked at, and declared that this was the Blessed Virgin's doing, because it had always said the rosary in her honour. Then it went to Purgatory, and a fortnight afterwards S. Dominic saw the happy soul go to heaven.

The manner in which we are taught that Mary leads her servants to heaven is more shocking to our minds than the power attributed to her over Hell and Purgatory. We do not refer to the false quotation from S. Ambrose, 'Open to us, O Mary, the gate of Paradise, since thou hast its keys;' or the equally false quotation from S. Anselm, 'It suffices, O Lady, that thou willest it, and our salvation is certain;' or the equally false quotation from S. Athanasius, 'And thou, O Lady, wast filled with grace that thou mightest be the way of our salvation, and the means of ascent to the heavenly kingdom;' or the daring parody of S. Bonaventure, 'Give ear, O ye nations; and all you who desire heaven, serve, honour Mary, and certainly you will find eternal life.' These are in no respect different from the rest of the book, but we call attention to the following story:—

'In the Franciscan Chronicles it is related, that brother Leo once saw a red ladder, on the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and a white one, on the top of which was his most holy Mother; and he saw some who tried to ascend the red ladder, and they mounted a few steps and fell; they tried again, and again fell. They were then advised to go and try the white ladder, and by that one they easily ascended, for our Blessed Lady stretched out her hands and helped them, and so they got safely to heaven.'—P. 201.

We shall add no comments to this vision. It embodies the teaching of the whole book, and we leave it to our readers to ponder over. We give the same story in its Spanish dress,

taken from the Spanish Month of Mary placed at the head of our article, a book in tenor and form very similar to that of S. Alfonso.

'One of the most intimate and familiar companions of S. Francis, brother Leo by name, beheld the following vision. (*Aurien.* t. ii. p. 289.) He saw in an extensive plain a representation of the last Judgment: there was an innumerable assemblage of persons, and others were continually coming at the blast of a terrible trumpet, which called them to judgment. Two ladders were placed, one red and the other white, which reached from earth to heaven. At the top of the first stood Jesus Christ, and near him the seraphic Father, who, with a loving countenance, exhorted his children to ascend by it; they began to do so, but before reaching the top they fell, some from the third step, some from the fourth, some from the tenth. Then the Holy Father, in great affliction, began to cry out to them that they should ascend by the other ladder, where the Most Holy Virgin was: the monks ran to it, that most pitying Mother gave them her hand, and they entered heaven. Wretched are we, if we have not recourse to that Supreme Lady, by whose means they that choose to climb the ladder, and to walk in the strait way of righteousness, will obtain salvation.'—*El Mes de Maria*, p. 47.

We shall not linger over the two last chapters of the Paraphrases of the *Salve Regina*, which continue in the same fashion to illustrate the words, 'O clement, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary.' Two or three passages will suffice.

"How is it," asks a writer, "that the Lord, who, under the old dispensation, was so rigorous in his punishment, now shows such mercy to persons guilty of far greater crimes?" And he answers, "That it is all for the love of Mary, and on account of her merits." "Oh, how long since," exclaims S. Fulgentius, "would the world have been destroyed had not Mary sustained it by her powerful intercession!"—P. 214.

This quotation from Fulgentius is one which S. Alfonso's editor has been unable to discover.

"Mary," says S. Antoninus, "is that throne of grace to which the Apostle S. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, exhorts us to fly with confidence that we may obtain the Divine mercy, and all the help we need for our salvation." (Heb. iv. 16.)—P. 215.

Father Charles Bovius relates, that in the principality of Dombes, in France, there was a married man, whose wife was jealous of another woman, and did nothing but call down both on her husband and the woman the judgments of God; and this she did especially one day that she came before an altar of the Blessed Virgin to pray for justice against this woman. The woman, however, was in the habit of going every day to recite "Hail, Mary!" before the same image. One night the Divine Mother appeared in a dream to the wife, who, on seeing her, began as usual to exclaim, "Justice, O Mother of God, justice!" But our Blessed Lady replied, "Justice! Chastisements! dost thou seek them of me? No, go to others, for I will not grant what thou askest; for know," she added, "that that sinner recites every day a salutation in my honour, and by whomsoever it is recited, it deprives me of the power of allowing her to suffer, or to be chastised for her sins." In the morning the wife went to hear mass in the above-named church of our Blessed Lady, and on returning home met this woman, and immediately began to abuse her, and then declared that she was a witch, and

that she had succeeded even in enchanting the Blessed Virgin herself. The people who were present told her to hold her tongue. "Be silent! indeed I will not, for what I say is true; for last night our Blessed Lady appeared to me, and when I demanded justice, she told me that she could not grant it, on account of a salutation offered her every day by this wretch." The woman was then asked what salutation it was that she offered every day to the Mother of God, and she replied that it was the "Hail, Mary!" On hearing that for that trifling devotion the Blessed Virgin had shown her such mercy, she went and cast herself before the holy image, and there, in the presence of all, she asked pardon for the scandal she had given, and made a vow of perpetual chastity. She then clothed herself with the habit of a nun, built herself a little room near the church, and there remained until her death, leading a life of continual mortification and penance.—P. 216.

We shall refer to the moral tendency of this story by and by. The sweetness of Mary's name is thus exhibited:—

'It is narrated in the life of the Rev. Father Juvenal Ancina, Bishop of Saluzzo, that in pronouncing the name of Mary, he tasted so great and sensible a sweetness, that, after doing so, he licked his lips. We read also, that a lady at Cologne told the Bishop Marsilius, that, as often as she uttered the name of Mary, she experienced a taste far sweeter than honey. The Bishop imitated her, and experienced the same thing.'—P. 220.

'One day, in the hearing of S. Bridget, Jesus Christ promised his most holy Mother, that he would grant three special graces to those who invoke that holy name (Mary) with confidence: first, that he would grant them perfect sorrow for their sins; second, that their crimes should be atoned for; and, thirdly, strength to attain perfection; and at length the glory of Paradise.'—P. 226.

In two of the previous Examples we have seen how sinners were willing to deny God and Jesus Christ, but were saved by refusing to deny their beloved mother, Mary: in the following case we see how much more dear is the name of Mary than the sign of the Cross. There was a young woman, we are told, who was sent to market, and desired to sleep at her aunt's house in the town; but her aunt not giving her a bed, she was not able to get home while daylight continued:—

'Night came on whilst she was on the road, and in a great passion she called on the Devil with a loud voice, to assist her. She had scarcely done so, when he appeared to her under the form of a man, and promised to help her, provided she would do one thing. "I will do anything," replied the unfortunate creature. "All that I require," said the enemy, "is, that you should no longer make the sign of the Cross, and that you should change your name." "As to the sign of the Cross," said the girl, "I will no more make it, but my name of Mary is too dear to me; I will never change it." "Then I will not help you," said the Devil. At length, after much disputing, it was agreed that she should be called by the first letter of the name of Mary; that is, M. On this arrangement, they started for Antwerp: and there the poor wretch remained with this wicked companion for seven years, leading a most shameful life, and a scandal to all.'—P. 229.

The conclusion of course is, that she is converted by 'having still preserved a spark of devotion towards the mother of God,

and so became 'transformed into a happy slave of her benefactress.' Mr. Duffy, as usual, omits the readiness to give up the sign of the Cross, and he also makes the time spent with the Devil at Antwerp, *six* instead of *seven* years. The American edition explains the bearing of the story thus, 'A girl rescued from the Devil by one letter of the name of Mary' (p. 792).

There is a tenderness about the following prayer which might be very beautiful:—

'O great Mother of God and my Mother Mary, it is true that I am unworthy to name thee: but thou who lovest me, and desirest my salvation, must, notwithstanding the impurity of my tongue, grant that I may always invoke thy most holy and powerful name in my aid, for thy name is the succour of the living and the salvation of the dying. Ah! most pure Mary, most sweet Mary, grant that from henceforth thy name may be the breath of my life. O Lady, delay not to aid me when I invoke thee, for in all the temptations which assail me, and in all my wants, I will never cease calling upon thee, and repeating again and again, Mary! Mary! Thus it is that I hope to act during my life and more particularly at death, that after the last struggle, I may eternally praise thy beloved name in heaven, O clement, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary! Ah, Mary! most amiable Mary! with what consolation, what sweetness, what confidence, what tenderness, is my soul penetrated in only naming, in only thinking of thee!' &c. &c.—P. 231.

We have thus patiently led our readers through the First Part of the Glories of Mary—the Church of Rome's authorized manual, as it may be called, on the subject of the worship¹ of S. Mary—and now we will pause for a few moments and look back on what we have learnt. There are several ways in which we might consider it. We might examine it theologically: Is it true? Or we might deal with it as a moral and religious question: Is it good? The first course would lead us to inquire, Is this really and indeed the Christian religion? The second, Is this teaching such as would produce holy lives and godly affections in those who are subject to it?

We will first make a short investigation into the truth of these statements. Are they part of the Christian faith, or are they that *nouvelle foi* which the Abbé Laborde exclaims against in the bitterness of his soul? This may be examined into simply as a matter of fact.

¹ We are far from using this word in an offensive sense. No Roman Catholic can feel hurt at the use of a word adopted by the Pope. In the decree of Dec. 8th, 1854, Pius IX. urges all Catholics *colere, invocare, exorare beatissimam Dei genitricem*, translated as follows by the *Tablet* (Jan. 27th): 'Let all the children of the Catholic Church most dear to us, hear these our words; and, with a most ardent zeal of piety and love, proceed to worship, invoke, and pray to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, conceived without original sin.' The head of the Roman Catholic Church, therefore, now urges on his subjects a greater zeal and ardour in the worship of S. Mary than that which S. Alfonso has displayed in the above passages. In the same decree he states that 'the true object of this devotion' is S. Mary's 'Conception.' How that act can be an object of devotion, it passes our comprehension to imagine.

Our simple and natural course would be to compare Liguori's teaching with that of Scripture; but we are met on the threshold by the insurmountable difficulty that there is nothing in Scripture which we can take for the purpose of constituting our comparison—nothing positive, we mean, for we find numberless passages which directly and indirectly negative his doctrines. We learn from Liguori that S. Mary is Queen of Mercy (p. 13); that she is the Mother of all mankind (p. 23); that she offered her Son to the Father on Mount Calvary (p. 23); that she is especially the Mother of repentant sinners (p. 42); that she is our Life (p. 52); that God was reconciled with sinners by the humility and purity of Mary (p. 56); that she obtains us perseverance (p. 59); that she renders death sweet to her clients (p. 68); that she is our Protectress at the hour of death (p. 71); that she is the Hope of all (p. 79); that she is our only Refuge, Help, and Asylum (p. 81); that she is the Propitiatory of the whole world (p. 81); that she is the one City of Refuge (p. 89); that it is her office to withhold God's arm from chastising sinners until He is pacified (p. 93); that she is the Comfortress of the world, the Refuge of the unfortunate (p. 100); that we shall be heard more quickly if we call on the Name of Mary than if we call on the Name of Jesus (p. 106); that she is our Patroness (p. 106); that she is Queen of Heaven and Hell, of all saints, and all evil spirits, because she conquered the latter by her virtues, and the devil by her fair humility and holy life (p. 110); that she protects us from the Divine Justice and from the devil (p. 115); that at the name of Mary every knee bows and hell trembles (p. 116); that she is the Ladder of Paradise, the Gate of Heaven, the most true Mediatrix between God and man (p. 121); that her intercession is necessary for salvation (p. 122); that she is the Mediatrix of Grace (p. 124); that in her is all hope of life and virtue, all grace of the Way and Truth (p. 125); that in her we find eternal salvation (p. 125); that no one can enter heaven except by her (p. 127); that all graces of the spiritual life are transmitted by Mary (p. 127); that all gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed by her, to whomsoever, when, and as she pleases (p. 128); that from her the world receives every good (p. 128); that she is the Helper of the Redemption (p. 133); that she and her Son redeemed the world (p. 133); that she is the Co-operator in our Justification (p. 133); that the way of salvation is open to none otherwise than through Mary (p. 135); that God says, 'Go to Mary,' when we seek for grace from Him (p. 136); that the salvation of all depends on the favour and protection of Mary (p. 136); that the other saints intercede with her (p. 138); that she is a tender Advocate; that all power is given unto her in

heaven and earth (p. 145); that God obeys the command of Mary (p. 146); that Mary is omnipotent (p. 146); that the whole Church is under the dominion of Mary (p. 146); that what she wills is necessarily done (p. 147); that her prayers have something of a command in them (p. 151); that Jesus Christ is under an obligation to her to grant all she asks (p. 152); that she is the singular Refuge of the lost (p. 156); that she is the Advocate of the whole human race (p. 161); that her chief office in the world is to reconcile fallen souls with God (p. 167); that she is the great Peace-maker who obtains reconciliation, salvation, pardon, and mercy (p. 165); that she is the Throne prepared in mercy (p. 165); that in her is established the seat of God's government (p. 179); that she delivers her clients from hell (p. 183); that her clients will necessarily be saved (p. 184); that she has sent back many from hell to earth who have died in mortal sins (p. 188); that she consoles, relieves, and succours her clients in Purgatory (p. 195); that she delivers her clients from Purgatory by applying her merits (p. 195); that she carries away from Purgatory all who wear the Carmelite Scapular on the Saturday after they die, provided they have been chaste and have said her office (p. 196); that she does not suffer those who die clothed in the Scapular to go to hell (p. 485); that Mary leads her servants to heaven (p. 198); that she has the key of the Gate of Paradise (p. 199); that she is the Way of our salvation (p. 200); that it is for love of Mary and on account of her merits that God is more merciful under the New than under the Old Dispensation (p. 214); that her powerful intercession sustains the world (p. 214); that she is the Throne of grace to which S. Paul bids us fly (p. 215); that Christ has promised that all who invoke the holy Name of Mary with confidence shall have perfect sorrow for their sins, atonement for their crimes, strength to attain perfection, and shall reach the glory of Paradise (p. 226).

These statements, it will be seen, are taken just as they come, and no attempt has been made to increase their force by anything like artistic arrangement. They are scarcely, if at all, more than average specimens of all the rest of the book. But now what have we in Holy Scripture to compare with them? Comparison, as distinct from contrast, requires the existence of some similitude; but take any passage in which S. Mary is mentioned, from the salutation down to the period after the Ascension, and there is nothing in any way similar. It only remains, therefore, to contrast instead of comparing. But our readers are as well acquainted with Holy Writ as ourselves, and we remit that task to them, only begging them to remember these four things:—1. That S. Mary is represented as she is,

and not otherwise, in the Gospels. 2. That she is not mentioned at all in the Acts after the first chapter, or in the Epistles, although S. Paul has entered so minutely into the economy of the Christian scheme of salvation. 3. That Liguori transfers all that prophet and apostle has said of our Lord to S. Mary. 4. That all those passages which speak of the one Mediator between God and man not only ignore, but exclude the modern doctrine.

After Holy Scripture, we look to the testimony of the early Church. Do we find similar statements and a similar tone in the writings of the Fathers of the Church? Are we able to compare, or only to contrast? We will see. The expressions of the Catholic creeds, we need only remind our readers, are similar to those in Holy Scripture. We proceed to the Fathers of the first century. They are S. Clement, S. Ignatius, and S. Polycarp, and, we may add, Barnabas and Hermas, though the writings attributed to the latter are not their own. S. Clement makes no mention of S. Mary at all, but he does speak of prayers addressed to Jesus Christ, and to God through Jesus Christ.¹ S. Ignatius says nothing of S. Mary, except that there is 'one Physician born from Mary and from God,'² that 'the virginity of Mary' and the birth of her Son were mysteries concealed from Satan,³ that Christ was 'born of Mary.'⁴ He speaks of her in no more exalted terms than these, and his whole doctrine is that there is but one God, one Mediator, and one Comforter. S. Polycarp makes no mention of S. Mary. Barnabas makes no mention of S. Mary. Hermas makes no mention of S. Mary. During the first century and a half, then, there is not a trace of any prayer or invocation to S. Mary, or of any belief that she is our mediatrix and intercessor.

The second century supplies us with the testimony of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, S. Irenæus, S. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian. Justin mentions S. Mary three times: 'Mary drew her origin from Abraham';⁵ 'Mary the Virgin having received faith and joy, answered, "Be it unto me according to thy word;"'⁶ 'Joseph taking Him, together with Mary, went into Egypt.'⁷ By his pupil Tatian, by Athenagoras the philosopher, and by Theophilus, her name is not mentioned. In the Latin translation of S. Irenæus, we find the first passage (forgeries apart) which is attempted to be wrested to the support of the modern system. We give it in a

¹ Cap. xxi. and xxxvi. Pp. 88 and 124. Ed. Jacobson.

² Ep. ad Eph. c. vii. p. 274.

³ Ibid. c. xix. p. 290.

⁴ Ep. ad Trall. c. ix. p. 336.

⁵ Trypho, sect. 100, p. 195.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Sect. 102, p. 196.

note below.' He never speaks of her in higher terms than 'Mary,' or the 'Virgin Mary.' Clement of Alexandria speaks not a word in her honour. Tertullian represents her as guilty of unbelief.²

The third century gives us the names of Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, Methodius, and Lactantius. Origen never speaks of S. Mary in any higher terms than those which are applied to her by the English Church; but he does say that we must pray to God alone, and that the sword which pierced Mary's heart was that of her own unbelief; for 'if all have sinned and want the glory of God, being justified 'by His grace and redeemed, surely Mary, too, was offended at 'that time.'³ Gregory Thaumaturgus says nothing in her honour. S. Cyprian, much as he has written on prayer, says not a word in her reverence. S. Firmilian as little. Methodius (spurious works apart) says nothing. Lactantius uses no term of reverence beyond that of a 'holy Virgin.'

In the fourth century we meet with Eusebius, S. Athanasius, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Hilary, Macarius, S. Epiphanius, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. Ephraim Syrus, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Ambrose. Eusebius uses no terms of reverence towards S. Mary; neither do the Apostolical Canons, which are probably of about this date. S. Athanasius (forgeries apart) speaks of her no otherwise than as 'the holy Virgin who bare God;' but he writes, in arguing for the Godhead of Christ from the fact of prayer being addressed to Him, 'No one would 'pray to receive anything from God and the holy angels, or any 'other created being.'⁴ And thus we have reached and passed the date of the great Council of Nicæa. S. Cyril of Jerusalem must have given an account of her worship, had it existed, in his Catechetical Lectures. There is not a word. He calls her 'the pure and holy Virgin Mary,' 'who gave birth to God:' he says, 'By a virgin Eve came death; it was fitting that by a virgin, or rather of a virgin, life should appear:' he says that 'the Holy

¹ 'Etsi ea inobedierat Deo, sed hæc suas a est obedire Deo, uti Virginis Evæ rigo Maria fieret advocata, et quemadmodum astrictum est mortis genus humanum per virginem, *salvatur* per virginem æquâ lance disposita virginialis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam.' In order to make this applicable, the *Dublin Review* (June 1844) writes '*salvatur* per Virginem, æquâ,' &c. It is only the change of one letter and a comma. It should be said that this change was first suggested by Grabe in 1702. Bellarmine leaves out the words *Virginis Evæ*, and declares that S. Irenæus represents S. Mary as an Advocate. In this untruth he is followed by the Rev. J. B. Pagani, in a book called 'The End of the World,' which he has just published. S. Iren. adv. Her. lib. v. c. 19, p. 429. London, 1702.

² Adv. Marc. iv. 19, p. 433. Paris, 1695.

³ Cont. Cels. sect. 8, c. xxvii. vol. i. p. 761; and Hom. in Luc. xvii. vol. iii. p. 952. Ed. Delarue.

⁴ Vol. i. p. 299. Ed. Dufresnoy. 1748.

⁵ Vol. i. p. 561. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1698.

'Spirit made Mary holy that she might have power to receive Him by whom all things were made.'¹ Nothing else. S. Hilary has not a word in favour of religious reverence being paid to her; but he writes, 'Since that Virgin who conceived God is to come into the severity of the final judgment, who will dare to be judged of God?'² Macarius speaks of her in no other terms than the Creed. S. Epiphanius considers it a heresy to say that S. Mary had children by S. Joseph. The Church of England also regards her as ever-Virgin. But besides this, S. Epiphanius denies her Immaculate Conception, for he says that she was 'not born in any way differently from the nature of men'; he denies the story of her Assumption, for he says that 'her end is not known'; and writing on the Collyridian heresy, he expresses the orthodox doctrine as follows. Short extracts are probably known to our readers, and we therefore give the passages at some length.³

"Nay," (some will reply), "but the body of Mary is holy!" Yes, but not a deity. "Nay, but the Virgin is a virgin, and honoured!" Yes, yet not given for us to worship⁴, but herself worshipping Him who was born of her in the flesh. For this reason the Gospel confirms us, saying (in the words of our Lord), "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Lest any should think that the Holy Virgin was a being of superior excellence, He calls her "woman," as if He prophesied, on account of those divisions and heresies which were to take place on the earth, in order that no one, by admiring the Holy Virgin in excess, might fall into this folly of heresy. The whole story' (he continues) 'is full of absurdity. For what Scripture speaks of it? Which of the prophets ever suffered a man to be worshipped, not to say a woman? She is a chosen vessel, but she is a woman, and not at all changed in nature, though as to her mind and sense she is held in honour, as the bodies of the saints, or whatever else in point of honour I might mention more excellent; as Elijah, a virgin from his birth, and continuing so throughout, and being taken up, did not see death; as John, who lay upon the bosom of our Lord, whom Jesus loved; as the holy Thecla; and as Mary, honoured above her, because of the dispensation of which she was deemed worthy. But neither is Elijah, though among the living, an object of worship; nor is John an object of worship, though by his own prayer, or, rather, by receiving grace from God, he made his death wonderful; nor is Thecla, nor any one of the saints, an object of worship. For the old error shall not lord it over us, that we should leave the Living One, and worship things made by Him. "For they served and worshipped the creature more than the Creator." For if He willeth not that the angels be worshipped, how much more is He unwilling that worship should be paid to her who was born of Anna, and was given to Anna from Joachim, given to the father and mother by promise, but nevertheless not born differently from the nature of man.'—P. 1061. Paris, 1622; Tyler, p. 217.

¹ Cat. xii. c. 15; and Cat. xvii. c. 6.

² In Pa. 119, p. 262. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1693.

³ We have adopted the translation given by the late Rev. J. Endell Tyler, in his valuable and calmly-written book on the 'Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary.'

⁴ Compare the *colere*, *invocare*, *exorare* of Dec. 8, 1854.

Again:—

'God the Word, as a Creator, and of authority over the thing, formed Himself from the Virgin, as from the earth, having clothed Himself with flesh from the holy Virgin; but, nevertheless, not a virgin to be worshipped, nor that He might make her a deity, not that we might offer in her name, not that so many generations of women should become priestesses. God willed not this to take place in Salome, nor in Mary herself. He suffered her not to administer baptism, nor to bless the disciples; He did not commission her to rule upon earth; but only appointed this, that she should be a holy thing, and be deemed worthy of his kingdom. Whence, then, is the coiling serpent? Whence are his crooked counsels renewed? *Let Mary be in honour; but let the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary.* The mystery (that sacred thing, religious worship) is assigned, I do not say to no woman, but not even to any man; it is assigned to God. Neither do angels receive that ascription of glory (that doxology). Let these errors, written in the hearts of the deceived, be wiped away. Let the evil generated at the tree be obliterated from our sight. Let no one eat of the error which has arisen by means of holy Mary; for though the tree be beautiful, yet it is not given for food; and though Mary be most beautiful, and holy, and honoured, yet she is not intended to be worshipped. . . . And how many more things might be said? for these silly women offer to her the cake, as either worshipping Mary herself, or they take upon themselves to offer this rotten fruit in her behalf! *The whole thing is foolish and strange, and is a device and deceit of the devil. But, not to extend my discourse further, what I have already said will suffice. Let Mary be in honour. Let the Lord be worshipped.*—P. 1066; Tyler, p. 210.

In the writings of S. Basil the Great there is not one word of religious veneration of S. Mary, but he regards the sword which pierced her soul to have been the doubt and unbelief into which she fell at the time of the Passion.¹ The genuine writings of Gregory of Nazianzum are equally free from any expression of religious respect. There is a tragedy called 'Christ Suffering,' containing such expressions in abundance, from which Cardinal Wiseman quotes freely, as though it were genuine;² but it is acknowledged as spurious by Tillemont, Dupin, Baillet, Baronius, Rivet, Vossius, Bellarmin, Labbé, Ceillier, Caillau, as well as Cave. There is also an oration attributed to Gregory, (Calderon has made use of it, and Shelley has translated the drama,) which represents S. Cyprian, when a young man, alluring a young lady, with whom he was enamoured, into his power by magical arts, in which the following words occur: 'Justina, discarding all others, flies for refuge to God, 'who had protected Susanna and Thecla, and takes her own 'bridegroom for her champion against hateful lust. . . . Meditating on these, and more instances than these, (and beseeching 'the Virgin Mary to assist a virgin in peril,) she throws before 'her the charm of fasting and mortification,' &c. The Benedictine Editors retain this Oration amongst Gregory's works,

¹ Vol. iii. Ep. 260, p. 400. Paris, 1721.

² Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. W. Palmer, by N. Wiseman, D.D. Bishop of Melipotamus. London, 1841.

and declare that 'nowhere else is the protection and assistance 'of the Blessed Virgin Mary so clearly and explicitly commended in the fourth century.' This, we think, must be considered to be the strongest testimony against the similarity of the teaching of the fourth century and of the nineteenth, as exhibited in the works of S. Alfonso. That this Oration is likewise spurious, is satisfactorily proved by Mr. Endell Tyler.¹

The works attributed to S. Ephraim Syrus, like those of the last writer, may be classed under three heads. Some are acknowledged to be spurious, some are doubtful, and some genuine. The first of these classes we will refer to presently; in the last there is not a shadow of religious respect paid to S. Mary; in the doubtful class there occurs this passage, descriptive of the cries of the damned: 'Farewell, ye holy and just, from whom we are separated:—friends and relations, fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, apostles, prophets and martyrs of the Lord! Farewell, Lady, who didst give birth to God! Thou indeed didst labour much, exhorting us to save ourselves, but we would not repent and be saved. Farewell thou, too, honoured and life-giving Cross! farewell, thou paradise of delight which the Lord planted! farewell, Jerusalem, who art above, the mother of the first-born! farewell, kingdom of heaven that hast no end! fare ye all well! We shall never see you again. We are going to judgment, which hath no end or rest.'

We repeat, it is more than doubtful whether this passage is genuine; but suppose it is: the writer speaks elsewhere of 'our Mother Jerusalem which is above, calling upon us with love and desire to come to her,' just as here he represents S. Mary as anxious for our salvation. Eastern poetry is poetry.

In the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, there is not a trace of invocation or of religious regard. S. Ambrose writes as Bishop Pearson has written, except that the latter has expressed himself more strongly in honour of S. Mary than the former. He distinctly anticipates and rejects the doctrine, that S. Mary assisted in the Redemption at the time of the Passion.² With S. Ambrose we reach the end of four hundred years of the Church's life.

We will examine the teaching of one more century. During the fifth century we meet with the great names of S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, and S. Jerome, of Basil of Seleucia, Orosius, Sedulius, Vincentius Lirinensis, S. Cyril of Alexandria, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodoret, Prosper, S. Leo, Hilarius, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius Symmachus. In S. Chrysostom's

¹ Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Appendix C, p. 402.

² Vol. ii. p. 220; Tyler, p. 260.

³ Vol. ii. p. 260. Ed. Bened. 1636.

works, there is not anything approaching to an invocation of S. Mary, nor any expression of confidence in her intercession and merits. On the contrary, he considers her character to have been imperfect, and declares that it was 'excessive ambition,' 'foolish arrogance,' and 'vain glory,' that made her 'stand without and desire to speak with Him.'¹ S. Augustine writes of her throughout in the same terms as members of the English Church employ, and in no others. Far the strongest passage which is found in his works is the following, in which he declines, 'for the honour of the Lord,' to say whether or no she was personally sinful:—

'Except, therefore, the Holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom, for the honour of the Lord, I wish not any question at all to be discussed when the subject is on sins—for how can we tell whether a greater portion of grace was not given to her to enable her to conquer sin altogether, who was thought worthy to conceive and bring forth Him, who, it is certain, had no sin?—except this Virgin only, if we could collect all the holy men and holy women who ever lived here, would they not confess, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves?"'²—Vol. x. p. 144.

In S. Jerome's works, there is not a word which can be brought forward in support of the modern system. He regards her as ever-virgin, and as an example to virgins;³ he speaks of death having come by Eve, and life by Mary;⁴ he considers the branch in Isaiah xi. 1. to be 'the mother of our Lord, 'simple, pure, sincere, with no external germ, and, after the 'likeness of God, fruitful in herself alone,' and 'the flower of the branch' to be 'Christ';⁵ he says that 'the clear light of 'Mary hides the little fires of other holy women, such as Anna 'and Elizabeth.'⁶ But he says no more, and he adds, 'We 'worship not nor adore, I do not say, the relics of martyrs, but 'neither the sun, nor the moon, nor angels, nor archangels, nor 'cherubim, nor seraphim, nor any name that is named in the 'present world, or in the world to come, lest we serve the 'creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever;⁷ and he translates and so adopts the homily of Origen, in which the latter speaks of S. Mary as having been scandalized at the time of the Passion.⁸

All the passages which have been quoted from the works of Basil of Seleucia are spurious. Orosius says nothing of S. Mary. Sedulius, in one of his poems, speaks of her as the woman through whom alone the way of life was effected.⁹

¹ Vol. vii. p. 467. Paris, 1718.

² That this means actual, not original, sin, is shown by his expressly stating that she was conceived and born in sin.—Vol. iv. p. 241; vol. x. p. 654; vol. iii. part i. p. 268. Paris, 1700.

³ Ep. 107, p. 679. Ed. Bened. Veronæ, 1734.

⁴ Ep. 22, vol. i. p. 120.

⁵ Vol. i. p. 101.

⁶ Vol. vi. p. 671.

⁷ Ep. 109, vol. i. p. 720.

⁸ Hom. xvii. in Luc. vol. vii. p. 300. ⁹ Bib. Vet. Pat. Venetiis, 1773, tom. ix.

The well-known Vincentius Lirinensis bids no one 'attempt to defraud the Holy Mary of the privileges and special glory of divine grace; for by the singular gift of our Lord and God, her Son, she must be most truly and blessedly confessed to be Theotocos.'¹ He knew no other privilege which she has, except that of bearing Him who was God. S. Cyril of Alexandria (in his genuine writings) speaks in the same strain, and no other. She is 'Theotocos' and 'the Holy Virgin.'² Like Tertullian, Origen, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and other Fathers, he tells us that she had imperfections, and that her faith failed at the time of the Crucifixion, and he gives that as the reason why our Lord entrusted her to S. John, because he, being versed in divine mysteries, could enlighten her ignorance;³ and he tells us 'not to wonder at all if the Virgin was ignorant on a point on which even the Holy Apostles themselves were of little faith.'⁴ Isidore of Pelusium speaks of her in no other way than as the Mother of our Lord. Theodoret argues that the titles of Theotocos and Anthropolocos ought to belong to S. Mary, because Christ was God and man—nothing more. Prosper simply speaks of her as an unspotted virgin, from whom Christ was born. In the genuine writings of Pope Leo, the great assertor of the true doctrine of the Incarnation, not a word of religious respect to S. Mary is found. Popes Hilarus, Simplicius, and Felix are alike free from any such expressions. Pope Gelasius calls her the most Holy Virgin Mary, and elsewhere he says 'that it *belongs alone* to the immaculate Lamb to have no sin at all; otherwise that might seem not to be imputed to Him alone if *any holy one besides* should be thought free from sin.'⁵ In the remains of Popes Anastasius and Symmachus there is nothing to the purpose; and this brings us beyond the boundary of the first five centuries of the Church's history.

In this review of the writers of the first five hundred years, we have not knowingly omitted a single passage expressive of religious respect for S. Mary, which is found either in *their genuine* or in *their doubtful* works. By comparing them, therefore, on the one

¹ Vinc. Lirin. Common.

² There is a homily attributed to S. Cyril, known under the name of *When the Seven*, which is to be found in Mansi, vol. iv. p. 1254; and another version of the same homily given in Aubert's edition of Cyril's works, called, 'An Encomium upon Holy Mary the Theotocos,' in which stronger expressions are to be found; but we cannot regard them as even doubtful. They are certainly spurious; but, unhappily, we have not the authority of the Benedictines to appeal to, as they have not edited S. Cyril. It is quoted by Cardinal Wiseman as genuine (Remarks, p. 25), and it should be said that Lasnage (Hist. Egl., tom. ii. p. 1214) admits it. Tyler proves it to be spurious. Appendix, p. 408.

³ Vol. iv. p. 1064. Paris, 1638. ⁴ Vol. vi. p. 391. ⁵ Sac. Conc. p. 1240. Paris, 1621.

hand, with the statements of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, and on the other with those of Bishop Pearson, whose words we have unhappily not space to quote,¹ our readers will be able to judge for themselves which of the two Churches, whose sentiments are expounded by these two writers, holds the ancient Catholic faith, and which that *nouvelle foi* of which the Abbé Laborde complains. We cannot do better than sum up this portion of our subject in the words of the Rev. E. Tyler, to whose conscientious labours we have been so much indebted :—

' We have examined to the utmost of our ability and means the remains of Christian antiquity. Especially have we searched into the writings of those whose works (A.D. 492) received the approbation of the Pope and his council at Rome; we have also diligently sought for evidence in the records of the early Councils; and we find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers—not for a few years, or in a portion of Christendom, but to the end of the first five hundred years and more, and in every country in the Eastern and the Western empire, in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia—testifying as with one voice that the writers and their contemporaries knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin, and her influence with God; no practice, in public or private, of prayer to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no ascription of divine honour and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer; and Christ, the only heavenly Mediator and Intercessor in whom they put their trust.'—P. 390.

But besides the genuine works of the early Fathers, and besides those which it is doubtful whether they wrote or not, there is a third class of writings which we must unfortunately likewise refer to. These are such as are acknowledged to be spurious or forged. S. Alfonso, in quoting 'devout prayers addressed by various Saints to the Divine Mother,' tells his reader that 'the following prayers are put here, not only that they may be used, but also that they may show the high idea that the Saints had of the power and mercy of Mary, and the great confidence they had in her patronage' (p. 232). Thus he declares that he is bringing forward historical evidence in proof of the doctrine which he is enforcing. With this profession in his mouth, how jealous ought he not to be, to be sure that the quotations which he makes are genuine, and to quote them correctly! We cannot conceive a more certain test of a truthful mind or a perverted conscience, than is supplied by the manner in which such a task as this is performed. How, then, does our author bear this trial? Does he cite what he does cite with accuracy? Does he cite the true writings of the Saint to whose authority he is appealing? The first of these questions

¹ Vide Pearson's 'Exposition of the Creed.'

is answered by a witness whose testimony is unimpeachable. The *Rambler*, in recommending its friends not to use the book which we are reviewing in controversy, says, 'To name but one and that not the chief cause of this unfitness, it is only necessary to mention that *S. Alphonsus did not scruple to make most important additions to the passages which he quoted from the Fathers*; and this, though perfectly allowable in a book of meditations,' [we do not here pause to examine the morality of this doctrine,] 'of course destroys its value as a work of authority in matters of controversy.' We need therefore say no more as to the accuracy of the passages cited. We must linger for a moment to show that he, and not only he, has scrupled as little to cite acknowledged forgeries as genuine.

The first false citations which we meet with (reckoning chronologically) are those which we have transcribed from pp. 185 and 188. The Apostolic Father S. Ignatius is there quoted; and the translation being given in the text, his supposed words are added in the note. They are as follows:—*Impossibile est aliquem salvari peccatorem nisi per tuum, O Virgo, auxilium et favorem. Quia quos non valeat Dei justitia salvat sua intercessione Maria, misericordia infinita. Ap. Celada in Jud. Fig. § 10. And again, Numquid peribit, qui genitrici Virgini devotus sedulusque extiterit.* S. Alfonso admits that some doubt whether S. Ignatius did write the first of these passages, but he declares that it has been adopted by S. Chrysostom, or as it is given in the Lyons translation of 1835 (p. 261), '*S. Jean Chrysostôme le lui attribue.*' We have already shown that it is untrue that S. Ignatius wrote one passage or the other, and equally untrue that S. Chrysostom adopted or attributed either of them to him.

The next author falsely cited as a witness to the worship of S. Mary is Origen. This, however, is not done by S. Alfonso, but by Cardinal Wiseman. There is a work called the '*Lament of Origen*,' which was declared spurious by Pope Gelasius and his council. It is quoted as genuine by Cardinal Wiseman: *Lectures*, vol. ii. p. 107; 1836. 'It is wonderful,' says Huet, Bishop of Avranches, 'that these works should be sometimes cited in evidence by some theologians, without any note of their being forgeries.'

The next spurious documents made use of to support the modern system on the point which we are examining, are three sermons attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus by Vossius, who first published them as Gregory's; they really belong to the seventh or eighth century. Bellarmin quotes one of them as a homily of S. Athanasius. Methodius comes next. S. Alfonso quotes him frequently, and, in a long prayer to S. Mary attributed to him, makes him say, 'We are all God's debtors, but

He is debtor to thee!' (P. 236.) Cardinal Wiseman¹ also quotes a homily attributed to him, to the same effect. The spuriousness of this work is declared by the Benedictine Editors of S. Jerome,² and by Baronius.³

From a supposed homily of S. Athanasius, S. Alfonso (p. 238), Bellarmin,⁴ and Cardinal Wiseman,⁵ quote a lengthy prayer of Invocation. The Benedictine Editors declare 'that there is 'no learned man who does not now adjudge this discourse to be 'spurious';⁶ and Baronius says that it cannot have been written previous to the Monothelite controversy.⁷ With S. Epiphanius' works, a spurious panegyric on the Mother of God is published.⁸ Next we come to Gregory of Nazianzum. We have already shown that the drama called 'Christ Suffering' has been quoted as genuine by Cardinal Wiseman, and has been declared spurious by Tillemont,⁹ Dupin,¹⁰ Baillet,¹¹ Baronius,¹² Rivet,¹³ Vossius,¹⁴ Bellarmin,¹⁵ Labbé,¹⁶ Ceillier,¹⁷ Caillau,¹⁸ Tyler.¹⁹ The homily which represents S. Cyprian as attempting to bring about his lustful purposes by magical arts, we have called doubtful, in compliment to the Benedictine Editors; but it is proved by Mr. Tyler to be spurious, if external proof were wanted.²⁰

From S. Ephraim Syrus we have a long prayer in S. Alfonso, in which S. Mary is addressed as 'the only Advocate of sinners,' and 'the Mediatrix between God and man' (p. 232). The prayer is spurious. Cardinal Wiseman likewise twice refers to S. Ephraim, and quotes him at length.²¹ The passages cited by Cardinal Wiseman as S. Ephraim's were not written by him, and have never been attributed to him by any one; they were first bound up in the same volume with S. Ephraim's works, in an edition published at Rome in 1732, and were printed from a Vatican MS., which does not pretend to contain the works of S. Ephraim. Another passage is quoted by Cardinal Wiseman as S. Ephraim's, from a sermon called the 'Eulogy of the Holy Virgin.' This is likewise spurious. Tillemont says that it has nothing of S. Ephraim about it, and is probably the production of a Jerusalem monk.

¹ Remarks, &c.

² In Feb. 2, p. 57. Paris, 1607.

³ Lectures, vol. ii. p. 108. 1836.

⁴ Letter to Stapleton. 1592.

⁵ Tom. ix. p. 559.

⁶ Tom. iv. part ii. p. 457.

⁷ Crit. Sacr. p. 343.

⁸ De Script. Eccles.

⁹ Hist. des Aut. Sac. Tom. vii. p. 176.

¹⁰ Op. Greg. Theol. vol. ii. p. 1205. Paris, 1840. Edited by M. Caillau, Priest of the Society of Mercy, called 'The Blessed Mary Immaculate in her Conception.'

¹¹ Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, p. 399.

¹² Ibid. p. 402.

¹³ Vol. ii. p. 910.

¹⁴ Vol. ii. p. 515. 1721.

¹⁵ Vol. ii. p. 332. Padua, 1777.

¹⁶ See Fabricius, vol. viii. p. 275.

¹⁷ Tom. ii. p. 372.

¹⁸ Tom. i. ad. anno. 34, p. 157.

¹⁹ Inst. Poet. lib. ii. c. 14, p. 72.

²⁰ De Script. Eccles.

²¹ Lectures, vol. ii. p. 109. Remarks, p. 20.

The 'Book of Meditations,' in which prayer is addressed to S. Mary, was once attributed to S. Augustine. This is quoted as genuine by Kirk and Berrington (p. 445); and Mr. Ambrose Lisle Phillipps¹ cites the 'glorious S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo,' in his third discourse to the Catechumens on the Creed, 'as referring the vision of S. John in the Apocalypse to our 'Blessed Lady.' Both of these publications are excluded from S. Augustine's works by the Benedictine Editors. Spurious passages are cited as S. Augustine's by Liguori, in pp. 326, 343, &c. Basil of Seleucia is quoted by S. Alfonso as calling S. Mary the Peace-maker and Umpire between God and man (p. 245). The supposed works of his, in which such expressions occur, were first published by Dausqueius, a Jesuit, in 1661; they were sent to him, he says, by his brother-Jesuit Schottus, having been just drawn out of their hiding-place. Fortunately, Photius has left us an account of the writings of Basil, and they are not those which the two Jesuits extracted from their hiding-place.

Two sermons supposed to have been delivered by S. Leo, on the feast of the Annunciation, are supposititious. The idle tale of S. Mary of Egypt, which Cardinal Wiseman calls 'a remarkable monument of most confident supplication to the Blessed Virgin,'² and which he supposes to have been written about A.D. 500, was probably composed about the close of the seventh century. S. Alfonso gives us the story (p. 66), but in so softened a form, that had it not been for 'the lion who came and made her grave with his claws,' we should scarcely have recognised it.

We have thus, as we believe, gone through all the genuine and doubtful passages, and all the more important spurious passages, found amongst the works of the writers of the first five centuries, which have a bearing on the devotion to S. Mary. By a reference to them, and to the quotations made from the 'Glories of Mary,' it will appear that there are mainly two foundations on which S. Alfonso and Cardinal Wiseman rest their system. One is that of forged documents; the other that of special revelations to individual saints. With regard to the first, our readers will form their own judgment; with regard to the last, we will say one word, to remind them that it entirely alters the standard or rule of the Christian faith. That Rule of Faith is no longer, according to the Anglican theory, Holy Scripture, as interpreted, where interpretation is needed, by the witness of the Church, exhibited in the annals of her history—it is no longer Holy Scripture and tradition, according to the Tridentine theory. It is Holy Scripture, tradition, and modern revelations—not a

¹ Manual of Devotion, p. 98. 1843.

² Remarks, p. 26.

single, nor a double, but a triple standard, which may vary from day to day. - The *amount* to which false quotations are made use of by S. Alfonso may be learnt from the following passage:—

'Hence the Divine Mother, on account of the great merit she acquired by this great sacrifice which she made to God for the salvation of the world, was justly called by S. Augustine, "The Repairer of the human race;" by S. Epiphanius, "The Redeemer of captives;" by S. Anselm, "The Repairer of a lost world;" by S. Germanus, "Our Liberator from our calamities;" by S. Ambrose, "The Mother of all the faithful;" by S. Augustine, "The Mother of the living;" and by S. Andrew of Crete, "The Mother of life." For Arnold of Chartres says, "The wills of Christ and of Mary were then united, so that both offered the same holocaust, she thereby producing with Him the one effect,—the salvation of the world." At the death of Jesus, Mary united her will to that of her Son, so much so, that both offered one and the same sacrifice; and therefore the holy Abbot says, that both the Son and the Mother effected the human redemption, and obtained salvation for men,—Jesus by satisfying for our sins, Mary by obtaining the application of this satisfaction to us. Hence, Denis the Carthusian also asserts, "that the Divine Mother can be called the Saviour of the world, since by the pain she endured in commiserating her Son (willingly sacrificed by her to Divine justice), she merited that through her prayers the merits of the Passion of the Redeemer should be communicated to men."—P. 343.

Whether S. Germanus, S. Andrew of Crete, Arnold of Chartres, and Denis the Carthusian, wrote the words here attributed to them, we neither know nor are we careful to know; but the first quotation from S. Augustine is spurious, the quotation from S. Epiphanius is spurious, the quotation from S. Anselm is spurious, the quotation from S. Ambrose is spurious, and the second quotation from S. Augustine is spurious. In the same manner, in p. 417, there are three quotations from S. Jerome, from S. Chrysostom, and S. Augustine—all of them are spurious.

We have still to consider the moral and religious tendency of this teaching. We have seen that it is not the ancient doctrine of the Christian Church; but although it is not true, is it nevertheless such as to produce godly life and chastened affections? Before examining this question, we will make a few extracts from the two latter portions of the book, though we have not space to do so with the same copiousness as we did from the first part.

'I will say, in the words of S. Philip Neri, "Immaculate Virgin, thou hast to save me." Grant that I may always remember thee; and then, do thou never forget me! The happy day, when I shall go to behold thy beauty in Paradise, seems a thousand years off. So much do I long to praise and love thee more than I can now do, my Mother! my Queen! my beloved, most beautiful, most sweet, most pure, Immaculate Mary! Amen!—P. 269.

'It is well known with what unanimity theologians and holy Fathers

(the holy Fathers *Duffy*—the very holy Fathers *Dunigan*) give Mary this title of Mediatrix, on account of her having obtained salvation for all, by her powerful intercession and merit so called of congruity, thereby procuring the great benefit of redemption for the lost world. *By her merit of congruity*, I say, for Jesus Christ alone is our Mediator by way of justice, and *by merit de condigno*, to use the school term, He having offered his merits to the Eternal Father, who accepted them for our salvation. Mary, on the other hand, is a Mediatrix of grace by way of simple intercession and merit of congruity, she having offered to God, as theologians say with S. Bonaventure, her merits for the salvation of all men, and God, as a favour, accepted them with the merits of Jesus Christ.—P. 275.

The difference, then, between the Redemption as wrought by Jesus and as wrought by Mary would be this. Both redeemed mankind by their merits: but God was bound, as a matter of justice, to accept the merits of Christ, and he accepted the merits of Mary as a matter of grace or favour.

‘Mary, then, was the Mediatrix of men; it may be asked, but how can she be called also the Mediatrix of angels? Many theologians maintain that Jesus Christ merited the grace of Perseverance for the angels also; so that as Jesus was their Mediator *de condigno*, so also Mary is said to be the Mediatrix even of angels *de congruo*, she having hastened the coming of the Redeemer by her prayers. At least meriting *de congruo* to become the Mother of the Messiah, she merited for the angels that the thrones lost by the devils should be filled up. Now, she at least merited this accidental glory for them; and therefore Richard of S. Victor says: “By her every creature is repaired; by her the ruin of the angels is remedied; and by her human nature is reconciled.” And before him S. Anselm said: “All things are recalled and reinstated in their primitive state by this Blessed Virgin.”—P. 278.

The quotation from S. Anselm is spurious.

‘From the first moment that this heavenly child was sanctified in her mother’s womb, which was the instant of her Immaculate Conception, she received the perfect use of reason *that she might begin to merit*. This is in accordance with the general opinion of theologians, and with that of Father Suarez in particular, who says that as the most perfect way in which God sanctifies a soul is by its own merit, as S. Thomas also teaches, it is thus we must believe that the Blessed Virgin was sanctified. “To be sanctified by one’s own act, is the more perfect way. Therefore it is to be believed that the Blessed Virgin was thus sanctified.”—P. 288.

Does it not follow from hence, that if the Immaculate Conception be true, S. Mary must have merited to have been immaculately conceived before she was conceived, and therefore that she must have enjoyed a previous state of existence? This would be a thing to be decreed by another dogma.

‘Supposing she had 1,000 degrees of grace in the first instant (of her conception), in the second she had 2,000, in the third 4,000, in the fourth 8,000, in the fifth 16,000, in the sixth 32,000. And we are as yet only at the sixth instant; but multiplied thus for an entire day, multiplied for nine months, consider what treasures of grace, merit, and sanctity Mary had already acquired at the moment of her birth.—P. 281.

Mr. F. W. Faber adopts this ‘arithmetic of Suarez’ in a

book published a month or two ago, called 'The Blessed Sacrament.' He writes:—

'We remember the various splendours of the angelic kingdom; and we remember how, in the one first moment of her Immaculate Conception, the imperial Mother of God was adorned with greater graces, and shone with greater merits, than all the angels put together, were they to add their merits into one for a million of years. *If we do the sum of her grace and merits by the arithmetic of Suarez, for which that saintly theologian was thanked by Mary herself*, how far beyond the expression of our figures has the sum advanced, when fifteen years of moments, each moment with the full use of reason, each moment even of slumber, meriting on a gigantic scale, are fully accomplished! To our eyes she is almost lost in the light of grace. We can hardly make a picture of what she was like as a Jewish woman of royal birth.'—P. 440.

Most true: the reality is eclipsed by the imaginary ideal. A few pages lower he says: 'She is so like Him, that when we describe her it sounds as if we were describing Him.' (P. 465.) That is true likewise.

'The Father crowned her by imparting his power to her; the Son his wisdom; the Holy Ghost his love. And the three Divine Persons, placing her throne at the right of that of Jesus, declared her Sovereign of heaven and earth, and commanded the angels and all creatures to acknowledge her as their Queen, and as such to serve and obey her.'—P. 370.

Accordingly the following doxology is occasionally in use in Spain at the end of sermons:—

'Gloria al Padre.

'Gloria al Hijo.

'Gloria al Espíritu Santo.

'Gloria à la Sacratísima Virgen.'

'Let us dedicate ourselves to the service of this Queen, to honour and love her as much as we can.'—P. 375.

'O great, exalted, and most glorious Lady, prostrate at the foot of thy throne, we adore thee from this valley of tears. . . . On this day, on which thou wast made Queen of the universe, we also consecrate ourselves to thy service. O Lady, change us from sinners into saints: work this miracle, which will redound more to thy honour than if thou didst restore sight to a thousand blind persons, or didst raise a thousand from the dead.'—P. 377.

We have seen that a very common Patristic explanation of the sword which was to pierce S. Mary's bosom, is the pang which she felt on the failure of her faith at the time of the crucifixion. As to the soundness of such an exposition, we express no opinion one way or another, but we notice the contrast of S. Alfonso's interpretation. Having spoken of Simeon's prophecy, he continues:—

'Whence the holy Abbot Arnold of Chartres says, "that whosoever had been present on Mount Calvary, to witness the great sacrifice of the Immaculate Lamb, would there have beheld two great altars, the one in the

body of Jesus, the other in the heart of Mary; for, on that mount, at the same time that the Son sacrificed his body by death, Mary sacrificed her soul by compassion."—P. 383.

'Richard on the words of St. Paul, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife," also says, that "Mary is the believing woman, by whose faith the unbelieving Adam and all his posterity are saved."'—P. 451.

'Tenth devotion in honour of Mary, To say or to hear Mass, or to have Mass said in honour of the Blessed Virgin.'—P. 492.

Mr. Faber goes far beyond this: he teaches that it is 'in accordance with sound theology, and the principles of the faith,' to maintain that in every consecrated host there is the Blessed Virgin's flesh and blood, viz.: that part which our Lord took on his Conception.¹

We will conclude our extracts from the second part of 'the Glories,' by three Examples which are given to teach respectively 'devotion to the dolours of Mary,' and the advantages of wearing the Scapular of her dolours. The first of these, on the testimony of S. Bridget's Revelations, gives an account of a prince who 'had given himself by an express compact as a 'slave to the devil, and for sixty successive years had served him, 'leading such a life as may be imagined.' S. Bridget, by revelation, sent her confessor to him as he was on his death-bed, and after some time he died contrite and resigned. 'After his death 'Jesus Christ again spoke to S. Bridget, and told him that the 'sinner was saved; that he was then in purgatory; and that he 'owed his salvation to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin 'His Mother; for the deceased, although he had led so wicked a 'life, had, nevertheless, always preserved devotion to her dolours, 'and whenever he thought of them pitied her' (p. 392). This revelation of S. Bridget is introduced in proof of a revelation of S. Elizabeth, by which the latter made known, that after her Assumption, S. Mary appeared with her Son to S. John the Evangelist while he was still on earth.

'The saint (S. John) then heard Mary ask her Son to grant some special grace to all those who are devoted to her dolours. Jesus promised her four principal ones:—1st. That those who before death invoke the Divine Mother in the name of her Saviour, *should obtain true repentance of all their sins.* 2d. That He would protect all who have this devotion in their tribulations, and that He would protect them especially at the hour of death. 3d. That He would impress upon their minds the remembrance of His passion, and that they should have their reward for it in heaven. 4th. That He would commit such devout clients to the hands of Mary, with the power to dispose of them in whatever manner she might please, and to obtain for them all the graces she might desire.'—P. 391.

¹ The Blessed Sacrament, p. 515.

S. John has failed to recount this interview in the Book of the Revelation, nor was any one aware of it, until it was narrated by Pelbertus as a revelation made to S. Elizabeth. The two Examples illustrating the efficacy of the Scapular are as follows :—

'A young man in Perugia promised the devil that if he would enable him to attain a sinful object he had in view, he would give him his soul; *and he gave him a written contract to this effect, signed in his own blood.* When the crime had been committed, the devil demanded the performance of the promise; and for this purpose led him to the brink of a well, at the same time threatening that if he did not throw himself in, he would drag him, body and soul, to hell. The wretched youth, thinking that it would be impossible to escape from his hands, got on the little parapet to cast himself in; but terrified at the idea of death, he told the devil that he had not courage to take the leap, but that, if he was determined on his death, he must push him in. The young man wore a Scapular of the dolours of Mary; the devil, therefore, said, "Take off that Scapular, and then I will push thee in." But the youth, discovering in the Scapular the protection still vouchsafed to him by the Divine Mother, refused to do so; and at length, after much altercation, the devil, filled with confusion, departed; and the sinner, grateful to his sorrowful Mother, went to thank her, and, penitent for his sins, presented as a votive offering to her altar, in the church of Santa Maria la Nuova, in Perugia, a picture of what had taken place.'—P. 421.

The other Example happened to a friend of S. Alfonso. He was engaged in hearing confession, when a young foreigner of noble birth came and confessed as follows :—

'Besides the other innumerable shameful crimes and murders he had committed, he said, that having entirely despaired of salvation, he committed sins no longer from inclination, but expressly to outrage God, out of the hatred he bore Him. He said, amongst other things, that he wore a crucifix, and that he beat it out of disrespect, and that that very morning, only a short time before, he had communicated sacrilegiously; and for what purpose? It was, that he might trample the sacred particle under his feet. And he had, indeed, already received it, and had only been prevented from executing his horrible design by the people who would have seen him. He then consigned the sacred particle, in a piece of paper, to the confessor. Having done this, he said, that passing before the church he had felt himself strongly impelled to enter it; that, unable to resist, he had done so. After entering, he was seized with great remorse of conscience, and at the same time a sort of confused and irresolute desire to confess his sins: and hence the reason for which he stood before the confessional; but while standing there his confusion and diffidence were so great that he endeavoured to go away, but it seemed to him as if some one held him there by force. "In the meantime," he said, "father, you called me, and now I am here making my confession, and I know not how." The father then asked him if he ever practised any devotion during the time; *meaning, towards the Blessed Virgin; for such conversions only come through the powerful hands of Mary.* "None, father—devotions indeed! I looked on myself as damned." "But reflect again," said the father. "Father, I did nothing," he repeated. But, putting his hand to his breast to uncover it, he remembered that he wore the Scapular of Mary's dolours. "Ah, my son," said the confessor, "dost thou not see it is our Blessed Lady who has obtained thee so extraordinary a grace? And know," he added, "that to her this church is dedicated."—P. 316.

The Third Part is altogether omitted in Mr. Duffy's edition. Why, we do not know. It is just like the other parts in its tone. Two or three specimens shall suffice:—

'When S. Dominic was preaching at Carcassone, in France, an Albigensian heretic, who for having publicly ridiculed the devotion of the rosary was possessed by devils, was brought to him. The saint then obliged the evil spirits to declare whether the things which he said about the most holy rosary were true. Howling, they replied: "Listen, Christians; all that this enemy of ours has said of Mary and of the most holy rosary is true." They, moreover, added that they had no power against the servants of Mary, and that many by invoking in death the name of Mary were saved, *contrary to their deserts*. They concluded, saying: "We are forced to declare that no one is lost who perseveres in devotion to Mary, and in that of the most holy rosary; for Mary obtains for those who are sinners true repentance before they die." S. Dominic then made the people recite the rosary; and, oh, prodigy! at every *Hail Mary*, evil spirits left the body of the possessed man, *under the form of red-hot coals*, so that when the rosary was finished, he was entirely freed. On this occasion many heretics were converted.'—P. 502.

'Blessed Father Patrizi, who had the greatest devotion to the *Hail Mary*, used to recite 500 a-day. Mary announced the hour of his death to him, and he died as a saint. After forty years a beautiful lily grew out of his mouth, and on each of the leaves was written the *Hail Mary*, in letters of gold. This lily was afterwards taken to France.'—P. 508.

So, too, there was a Cistercian lay-brother, who knew no other prayer except the *Hail Mary*, which he repeated continually; and after his death a tree grew from his grave, with *Hail Mary*, *full of grace*, on its leaves. References are gravely given for these two stories to 'Bolland, xv. Maii,' and 'Ap. Crass. tom. ii. tr. 6, p. 1;' but the editor has been obliged to confess that he could not find them. We should have referred to Ovid, who tells the tale more prettily, perhaps, than any one else.

'A devout servant of Mary went one day, without telling her husband, to visit a church of our Blessed Lady, and was prevented by a storm from returning home at night. She was greatly alarmed lest her husband should be angry at it; she, however, recommended herself to Mary, and returned home, when she found her husband very kind to her, and quite in a good humour. By her inquiries she learnt that the night before the Divine Mother had taken her form, and attended to all the duties of the household as a servant. She then related all that had taken place to her husband, and they both ever afterwards had the greatest devotion to the Blessed Virgin.'—P. 515.

'A devout virgin was in prayer, when she saw Jesus on a throne, in the act of sending a sinner to hell; but his most Holy Mother said that at one time he had honoured her, and obtained him thirty days in which to repent.'—P. 516.

'A great sinner was once in prayer at the feet of a crucifix, earnestly entreating that he might receive a sign of pardon; but not receiving it, he addressed himself to Mary in sorrow, who then appeared to him. He saw her present his tears to her Son, saying, Son, shall these tears be lost? He then understood that Christ had already pardoned him, and thenceforward led a holy life.'—P. 517.

'Mary is called the Gate of Heaven, because, as S. Bernardine declares, "No one can enter heaven unless by Mary, as through a door." Our Queen says, "My power is in Jerusalem." Richard of S. Lawrence adds, "Commanding what I will, and introducing whom I will."—P. 588.

'Ah, my Mother, in thee do I repose my hope of eternal salvation. I love thee; do thou save me; never allow a servant of thine, who loves thee, to go to blaspheme thee in hell.'—*Ibid.*

'O Mary, thou hast to save me! Thou art my hope!'—P. 594.

'O my Queen, Mediatrix of sinners, perform thy office; intercede for me. My sins shall not prevent me from trusting in thee, O great Mother of God! No, I trust in thee, and so great is my confidence, that were my salvation in my own hands, I would place it in thine. O Mary, receive me under thy protection, for that is all my desire.'—P. 599.

The book ends with forms of dedication of one's self and one's family to S. Mary, with ejaculatory prayers to her, and acclamations in her praise. The final ejaculatory prayer, 'with which she revealed to a devout that she was much pleased at being honoured by her servants,' is as follows:—

'I thank thee, O Eternal Father, for the power given to Mary, Thy daughter. *Our Father, Hail Mary, Glory be to the Father, &c.*

'I thank Thee, O Eternal Son, for the wisdom given to Mary, Thy Mother. *Our Father, Hail Mary, Glory be to the Father, &c.*

'I thank Thee, O Eternal and Holy Spirit, for the love given to Mary Thy Spouse. *Our Father, Hail Mary, Glory be to the Father, &c.*

'To thee do we cry, O Queen of Mercy, return, that we may behold thee dispensing favours, bestowing remedies, giving strength. Show us thy compassionate looks, and we shall be saved.

'O Sovereign Lady of all things, Saint of saints, [*splendour of the world,*¹] glory of heaven, acknowledge those who love thee; hear us, for thy Son honours thee by denying thee nothing.

'Run, hasten, O Lady, and in thy mercy help thy sinful servant, who calls upon thee, and deliver him from the hands of the enemy.

'Who will not sigh to thee? We sigh with love and grief, for we are oppressed on every side. How can we do otherwise than sigh to thee, O solace of the miserable, refuge of outcasts, ransom of captives? We are certain that when thou seest our miseries, thy compassion will hasten to relieve us.

'O our Sovereign Lady and our Advocate, commend us to thy Son. Grant, O blessed one, by the grace which thou hast merited, that He who

¹ These words, '*splendour of the world*,' are substituted by the Redemptorist and the Cardinal for the following, which is honestly given by the American translator: '*Our strength and refuge, God, as it were, OF THE WORLD.*' In making a translation of a book two things are to be considered—1, honesty; 2, prudence. Those who are not under the influence of the former principle should at least have regard to the latter. It was, surely, very imprudent of Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop Hughes, the Redemptorist Father, Mr. Duffy, and Mr. Dunigan, not to agree between themselves which passages they would alter. As it is, one is convicted by another. In the standard French edition of Liguori's works, published in Paris in the year 1842, by a Society of Ecclesiastics, and edited by the Abbés Vidal, Delaillie, and Bousquet, the words are as follows: *Domina rerum, Sancta sanctorum virtus nostra et refugium, Deus mundi, gloria cæli.* In the Sermon *Super Salve*, wherein the words occur, which is found in the Appendix to S. Bernard's works, the reading is *decus cæli.* But the editors of Liguori have nothing to do with what the unknown author of that sermon wrote, but only with what Liguori wrote.

through thee was graciously pleased to become a partaker in our infirmity and misery, may also, through thy intercession, make us partakers in His happiness and glory.

‘ In thee from my whole heart I have placed my hope.

‘ It is not possible, O Lady, that thou shouldst abandon him who has placed his hopes in thee.

‘ Thou hast only to will our salvation, and then it is not possible that we should not obtain it.

‘ Hail, Daughter of God the Father! Hail, Mother of God the Son! Hail, Spouse of God the Holy Ghost!

‘ O Virgin! how lovely thou art!

Mother of my God, my poor heart
Is filled with affection for thee.

‘ Thanks be to God and to Mary.

‘ May all things be to the eternal glory of the most Holy Trinity, and of Immaculate Mary!

‘ Live always, Jesus our love, and Mary our hope, with Saint Joseph and Saint Teresa, our advocates!’—P. 619.

In contrast with this rhapsody, we transcribe the sober and reverential words of one among ourselves, leaving our readers to draw the comparison, and the conclusions which result from that comparison, for themselves:—

‘ We honour the Virgin Mary, we love her memory, we would, by God’s grace, follow her example in faith and humility, meekness and obedience; we bless God for the wonderful work of salvation, in effecting which she was a chosen vessel; we call her a blessed saint and a holy Virgin; we cannot doubt of her eternal happiness through the merits of Him who was “God of the substance of his Father before the world, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world.” But we cannot address religious praises to her; we cannot trust in her merits, or intercession, or advocacy, for our acceptance with God; we cannot invoke her for any blessing, temporal or spiritual; we cannot pray to God through her intercession, or for it. This in us would be sin. We pray to God alone; we offer religious praise, our spiritual sacrifices, to God alone; we trust in God alone; we need no other mediator, we apply to no other mediator, intercessor, or advocate, in the unseen world, but Jesus Christ alone, the Son of God and the Son of Man. In this faith, we implore God alone, for the sake only of his Son, to keep us steadfast unto death; and in the full assurance of the belief that this faith is founded on the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, we will endeavour, by the blessing of the Eternal Shepherd and Bishop of souls, to preserve the same faith, as our Church now professes it, whole and undefiled, and to deliver it down, without spot or stain of superstition, to our children’s children, as their best inheritance for ever.’—Tyler, p. 391.

We have now to consider the morality of this teaching. That S. Alfonso was personally a devout man, we do not doubt; that his desire was to make others likewise devout, we as little question. Yet the tendency of his teaching is Antinomian in the extreme. We do not now refer to his Moral Theology,—‘the saint’s *mild morality*,’ which, as Cardinal Wiseman congratulates us, now ‘influences every confessional in England,’—but to the book with which we are at present dealing. The prac-

tical doctrine of the book is summed up in the Franciscan Brother's vision of the white and red ladders leading from earth to heaven: the latter being the ladder of Jesus Christ, by which men could not mount; the former that of the Blessed Virgin, by which they safely reached heaven. S. Alfonso has found an easier way of salvation than Christ the Way (p. 200); another door beside Christ the Door (p. 588); another mediator beside Christ the Mediator (p. 275); another intercessor beside Christ the Intercessor (p. 129); another advocate beside Christ the Advocate (p. 144); another redeemer beside Christ the Redeemer (p. 275); another saviour beside Christ the Saviour (p. 343). But what we have especially to note at present is, that salvation by Mary is *easier* than salvation by Christ. Salvation is to be had by Christ (so that it be dispensed by Mary), but it is a hard thing—the ladder is red; and though men try and try again, still, after having mounted a few steps, they fall off, for none stretches out a hand to help, though Christ stands looking down from the top. Then they have recourse to the white ladder, and our Blessed Lady—all tenderness, all mercy, all affection—at once extends to them her loving aid, and they are safe. Now, putting aside the wrong thus done to the yearning sympathies of Him who is our Brother, by whom we are brought nigh to the mercies of our Abba Father, let us ask ourselves what must be the practical moral tendencies of this teaching? Surely, that men in general will give up attempting to reach God's presence by the hard, rough ways which Christ requires, by faith and love and obedience, and self-denial for Christ's sake, and trust to the easier path pointed out to them. Add to this, that S. Mary is represented as especially the advocate of sinners as such (p. 157). Those whom the justice of Christ rejects are accepted and succoured by the mercy of Mary (p. 131). Those who are faithful clients of Mary cannot be lost (p. 183). This is, then, the first step—this is an easier and a surer way than that by Christ; and being easier, it will most surely be followed by the majority.

But yet this way, easier though it is, may still be too hard; devotion to Mary may be too much to require. Can a man remain in sin, and yet be safe by means of a third way? Yes; he need not have true devotion of the heart even to Mary: all that he has to do is, to keep up a form of external addresses and compliments to her, and as long as he does that he is safe from the devil. This is proved by the example of the lawyer and the monkey (p. 181), and many others. But it may be thought that, though safe for the time, still he may be finally lost. No, this is impossible. It is true that morality and Christianity alike teach that the effect of continuing in sin is, that the heart becomes

hardened, and so repentance at length next to impossible. But, according to this system, no such dread need be entertained by the sinner. Witness the promise made by our Lord in the hearing of S. John the Evangelist, that all 'who before death invoked the Divine Mother in the name of her sorrows, should obtain true repentance of all their sins' (p. 391); and the Example of the man who had been serving the devil as his slave by express compact for sixty years, and yet was moved to contrition, and saved at the intercession of S. Mary, because, 'although he had led so wicked a life, he had nevertheless always preserved devotion to her dolours, and whenever he thought of them pitied her' (p. 392). Again, experience and Christianity alike teach that a man may be cut off in the midst of deadly sin, and no time given him for repentance. No such dread has to be entertained by the sinner who offers an external form of devotion to S. Mary. Such an one is either kept alive on earth, that he may have the means of repenting—witness the example of the two students in Flanders, both equally guilty, but one saved alive because he said some Hail Marys without devotion and half asleep; the other damned because he did not (p. 190)—or, supposing that he is hurried away by death, still he is saved from hell; S. Mary sends him back again to earth, like the deacon Adelman (p. 188), or a canon, who was drowned in the Seine, but sent back from hell because, though he was in mortal sin, he nevertheless was praising Mary when he fell into the river (p. 519). Or, if not sent back for years like the canon, 'to propagate devotion to the Immaculate Conception,' still his soul is kept out of hell on earth, like the skeleton mentioned by Pelbertus (p. 189), or Alexandra's head (p. 197); or a robber's head in Normandy (p. 506). This, then, is the second step in making easy that which God has not made easy.

There is still a third step. Hitherto it has only been proved that those who are devout to S. Mary, or who keep up a form of devotion in her honour, are sure of final salvation, however sinful their lives may be; but suppose that people will not be devout even to S. Mary, and are too careless to keep up even a mechanical habit of saying *Hail Mary* each day, is there no other way still easier for them? There is: they must put on the Scapular of Mary's dolours: then they are quite safe from the devil in this life, though they have sold their souls to him and signed the contract in their own blood, as proved by the Example of the young man in Perugia (p. 421); they will receive the gift of repentance—witness the young nobleman who carried about the crucifix in order to beat it (p. 346); they are quite safe from the devil in the next life, for S. Mary promised S. Simon Stock, that 'whoever died clothed with it should not

suffer eternal flames' (p. 485); they are quite safe from a lengthened suffering in Purgatory, because S. Mary will come down and take them out on the very next Saturday after their deaths, as testified by Pope John XXII., Pope Alexander V., Pope Clement VII., Pope Pius V., and Pope Gregory XIII.¹

We will not trace this subject further. We have shown that S. Alfonso de' Liguori's system is an exaggeration of the exaggerations of Bonaventure and the two Bernardines. We have shown that his system is fully sanctioned by the whole weight of the authority of the Church of Rome, and, indeed, that the latter has shot far ahead of him into still wilder exaggerations since the 8th of December last. We have shown that it is totally different from, and opposed to, the doctrine of the Christian Church for the first five hundred years. We have shown that it has grown up by help of spurious quotations and false revelations, and we cannot see where it is to stop. We have shown further, that if a man desired to remain in sin and yet to reach heaven at last, this system is just such as would encourage him in his evil course of life, by making easy that which God has not made easy, and discovering a less self-denying Way than that of Jesus whereby to arrive at final salvation.

Had we space, we might point out the wrong done to the character of her who was highly favoured and blessed among women, by representing her as actuated by such fantastic notions as those on which she is supposed to act, without regard to either right or justice—nay, in contradiction to them (pp. 216, 502). And, still more, we might grieve over the picture, not only of our Abba Father, but of Him who loved us, and gave Himself for us—our Brother—the tender sympathies of whose human heart, we read, were moved even to tears at his brethren's sufferings. But these are points rather for our readers to meditate over than for us to enlarge upon in these pages. We will but add the eloquent and touching words of one of the deepest thinkers of the day, embodying conclusions which he drew from his experience of Italy, and the system there practically prevalent.

'The beautiful conception of the Virgin,' writes Mr. Gladstone, 'as affording the tenderness and intensity of feminine sympathies to be our medium of communication with the transcendent glory of the Son, disguises a reality of infinite danger. It is the very reverse of the method taken with

¹ Pope Paul V. has added two more conditions to that of wearing the Scapular to ensure being taken out of purgatory the Saturday after death, viz., chastity, and saying the little office of the blessed Virgin, or, if the last is too much, keeping the fasts of the Church, and abstaining on Wednesdays; but S. Mary is not narrated to have added these conditions when she appeared to Pope John XXII. and made the promise.

children, which hides bitter but wholesome drugs under some sweet confection :—

‘*Succhi amari ingannato ei beve
E dall’ inganno suo vita riceve.*’

For here poison is carried to the lips under an exterior the most attractive. The practical upshot, though I cannot believe it to be, even in the extremest case, the conscious intention, of the whole is a tendency infinitely various in degree, but sometimes direct and absolute, to extrude our Saviour, in the view of the believer, from many or even all of His redeeming functions, and to leave him only in the stern unapproachable character of a Judge. To her will, by some strange process, the effectuation of His coming is referred, as if it had been not an instrument merely, but a cause. The habitual communion with Him into whose Body we have been incorporated by Baptism, and who, through the medium of that Body, becomes the sustenance of our daily life, is made to pass through the intervention of her person. The constant application of His blood and merits, whereby alone we can for a moment stand in the place of sons, and realize the spirit of adoption, is exhibited as dependent on her prayers, to which we are to resort for habitual aid. In short, she is practically exhibited as the Way, and He as the Truth and the Life, mainly or even alone approachable by that way. Hence it is, that common devotion seems to revert naturally to her in a thousand secondary forms, where to us it would seem that the privileges of the covenant, as well as the necessities of our condition, carry us directly to our Redeemer As though all human sympathy were not absolute deadness in comparison with the exquisite sensibility of Him, whom in all things it behoved to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High-priest, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. As though all human love were not shallowness itself in comparison with the unexplored profoundness of those yearnings of affection, which, with more power than superstition ever ascribed to magic charms, did draw down the sun of heaven from its throne, did clothe the Very and Eternal Word with the form of a servant, with the likeness of men, so that He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. As if the Maker of woman did not possess in inexhaustible abundance those treasures of tenderness from and out of whose overflow it is that He has adorned the loveliest of His works.’—*Church Principles*, vii. 34, 35.

ART. VII.—*The Principles of Divine Service.* *An Inquiry concerning the true Manner of understanding and using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church.* By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M. A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, late Principal of the Theological College, Chichester. Oxford and London: John Henry and James Parker. Cambridge: Macmillans. 1855.

It is with satisfaction that we welcome the first volume (the only one which has yet appeared) of a treatise upon the principles of Divine Service, from the accomplished pen of Mr. Philip Freeman. His inquiry, as far as it has yet been made public, is confined to the Lesser Services, leaving the Eucharist for the second part.

A clear and strong perception runs through all Mr. Freeman's views—harmonizing and systematizing his dissertations—of the distinctness and independence as to origin of the Daily and Lesser Offices from the Eucharist, while in their nature and construction they refer and work up to the sovereign action of Christian worship. The proof of this distinctness and independence forms a main topic of the present volume, which starts accordingly from two especial points of departure,—the derivation of the Western Hour Offices from the East, and the compilation of our present ritual from the earlier English services. On both these topics Mr. Freeman, in his whole grasp of the subject and tone of handling it, offers a very remarkable contrast to that former school of ritualists to whom our students in theology were perforce wont to refer; while, of course, he likewise treads ground by the nature of things unknown to the Roman Catholic writers who have treated of the history of the Breviary. These authors, it is clear, could not, unless more than human, have looked upon the eastern offices with that eye of impartiality demanded by their theme; while the English Prayer-book was a still more forbidden tract of territory, both as to its own subject-matter, and as illustrative, viewed comparatively, of the philosophy of Divine Worship. Accordingly, the discussion of this important branch of ritual lore in its entirety was still a literary desideratum, towards supplying which we possess in the work before us a very meritorious contribution by one whom a mind, at once scholarly and accomplished, peculiarly fits for the task. For the shortcomings of our older writers, as Mr. Freeman observes at the commencement of his Introductory Chapter, the excuse may be made that—

'It must be borne in mind that when these services first received, in the sixteenth century, the shape in which for the most part we still possess them, no explanation was put forth of the design of the several parts, or of the relation which they bear to each other; nor any statement made of the great principles upon which the use of such services is based, and their structure regulated. The revisers of the Offices doubtless took it for granted that these things were understood, and needed not to be recapitulated by them; more especially as the old services would stand that generation in the stead of exponents, to a great degree, of the revised Ritual. All that they did, therefore, was to prefix a very brief and general account of the grounds there were for a Revision, and of the objects chiefly aimed at in it.'—Pp. 1, 2.

And, as he goes on to remark,—

'It is indeed probable that they had themselves but an imperfect perception of the entire nature of the forms which, after thus revising them to the best of their power, they handed down.'—P. 2.

Thus the revised Prayer-book was launched with a merely traditionary key to its signification, and before the age of scholiasts had grown up, the usual result had occurred, that the scholiast became at once more necessary and less serviceable, from the decaying of those oral illustrations which might, if embodied, have furnished the best scholia, while their very loss it was that led industrious scholars to strive to supply their place by formal comments. Our age, of course, to follow the parallel pattern, is to be reckoned the dawn of critical editions. If Comber and Sparrow were the Didymus and the Eustathius of the Prayer-book, Mr. Palmer and Mr. Freeman assume the position of a Budæus or a Stephens.

In the particular instance of the English Prayer-book, the Puritan conflict was, it is evident, peculiarly pernicious, both in the days of its earlier struggles, when it called away the best energies of those who would otherwise have been engaged upon constructive studies to the more immediate needs of controversial strategy, and in the latter phase of its material success, when physical means of destruction were superadded to intellectual vexation. Situated too, as the Church of England was, during the earlier decades of her reformed life, between two fires, and the Puritan one that from which, after the defeat of the Armada, the real material danger lay, the defenders of the Prayer-book had to 'economise,' as the term is, in their line of defence. To have paraded the truth that the impugned book was a *rifacimento* of the older services, with their corruptions only eliminated, would have been to throw away the remaining hope of saving it; in days before it had, in its new aspect, acquired that traditionary *vis inertiae* which now attaches to it, and which we are apt rather forgetfully to attribute to it when the battle was raging over every line in its pages. It was saved, thanks to Almighty good-

ness! but the process of its preservation inevitably caused the destruction of much of its attendant lore of illustration. We saved the citadel, but we had to sink the half of our fleet in order so to do. Besides, our dogmatic attitude towards the Papacy itself did not incline those divines to look very favourably upon sources of ritual information and forms of service, which most naturally appeared in the eyes of such writers in the aspect of being the ritual and the services of a Church which at no long period before was, as a strong undoubted fact, at one in doctrine and communion with later Rome. It remained for our more distant and calm-judging epoch to realize their derivation from primitive days of purity and zeal, which make their connexion with the Popes of Avignon, and the Rome of the Borgias and the Medicis, a mere accident of their old-world pedigree.

Accordingly, the general High Church mind of England settled down, with reference at least to the daily services, (for the '*Liturgy*,' as was right, always commanded a deeper attention, and evolved from its all-important doctrinal bearings a higher critical acumen,) to a sort of general conviction that they were somehow primitive, and so on; that the '*Te Deum*' was the Hymn of S. Ambrose, as the '*Quicunque*' was that of S. Athanasius, and the Prayer of S. Chrysostom the work of its reputed author,—without any definite idea, or rather any idea at all, of the reason of the sequence of the services and the composition of their various parts, beyond the notion that we were indebted for it all to the wisdom of our Reformation. Such was the better, the more instructed, view. The popular one was the mere police conception of a set form of prayers to keep things quiet in church. We must explain that we intend this charge of prevalent apathy to apply to the history only of the Prayer-book. Simultaneously with it, there has always existed an affection—English and undemonstrative enough, but still real and deep—for the contents of the book of whose analytical history our people are so profoundly ignorant. This was attributable clearly to the intrinsic beauty and worth of those materials which the Englishman learned to love and value in his own native language for their own sake, without having had his susceptibilities crossed by the ghost of a suspicion that these his own prayers, his own canticles, and his own litany, had been for centuries, in somewhat varied forms and in another tongue, and still to a considerable extent were, the authorized prayers, canticles, and litanies of unnumbered millions of Papists. And thus the Prayer-book has become a national institution, not likely now to be imperilled by the historical investigation of its materials, however it may be, more or less, in jeopardy from direct assaults upon the doctrines which it contains, irrespective of whether the

peccant passages came down from the days of Austin and Gregory, or were the orthodox composition of learned Caroline divines.

Mr. Freeman points out, later in his book, the vast quiet influence which the continual use of the Prayer-book must have had in forming the English character,—an influence which has probably been the greater from being unperceived, but which now and then crops out spontaneously in the warm manner in which well-disposed localities accept, as if by instinct, (unless some external disturbing force is brought to bear,) the correct performance of the services newly revived, as responsive to that innate sense of what the Prayer-book really means, which was all along in them, although they never had known its latent existence.

It was the natural result of all these predisposing causes that our best men, generally speaking, were not the specific illustrators of our ritual during the great days of Anglican theology. Hooker, Andrews, and Cosin, each wrote a little on the Prayer-book, but their writings on other topics compose the overpowering bulk of their compositions, and the illustration of the English services, accordingly rested with Sparrow, L'Estrange, Comber, Wheatley and Nicholls, and not with Bramhall, Hammond, Pearson, Thorndike, Taylor, Beveridge, and Bull. This fact is not to be overlooked in the comparative estimate of the older with the new school of ritualists.

Mr. Freeman's estimate of Hooker's services in the Fifth Book of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' in defence of the Prayer-book, may be gathered from the following extract, forming the commencement of a longer passage:—

'Hooker especially has searched deep into the principles upon which many of the great elements of Divine Service and Worship, contained in our Offices, are based; and thus vindicated their general character, as well as many details of arrangement and expression. And these profound searchings and eloquent vindications will never be equalled or superseded on their own ground, and as far as they go. But the range of Hooker's comments was greatly narrowed by his controversial position. Where his opponents objected, he defended; but beyond this the nature of his work did not call upon him to enter into the matter or order of Services. And again, the effectiveness of his championship, even on such points as he has occasion to treat of, is greatly impaired by one very material defect in the appliances which he had at command for dealing with the subject. With the older Offices of the English Church there is little or no appearance of his having been acquainted; whereas these, as must be evident from what has been already said, were likely in many points to be the best if not the only clue to the real character of the existing Services.'—Pp. 4, 5.

We think that Mr. Freeman hardly indicates sufficient appreciation of the curious collection of *Variorum* notes to the Prayer-book by Bishops Andrews and Cosin, attached to Nicholls' edition, of which he only notices those by the former prelate.

'Fortuitously preserved' they were, and necessarily 'fragmentary.' But in them we think we can discern more clearly than in other contemporary illustrators, the perception of the origin of our services, and of a feeling of the way in which their performance should symbolise their nature. This was to have been expected from the character and other actions of those prelates, and we can but regret that their writings upon the Prayer-book should not have been more full and systematic.

Indeed, we are inclined to believe that the school of the seventeenth century rather did itself injustice than otherwise, in the mere *literary* aspect of ritualism, from its having, while hampered, as we have above seen, in the illustration of the Prayer-book, devoted its prime energies to the, after all, main thing,—the performance of the services therein contained. No student of ecclesiology is ignorant how zealously these same writers, who seem in their books so careless of the anti-reformational descent of the Prayer-book, laboured in their church arrangements to make that descent apparent,—in their preservation or restoration of stately altars for the Eucharist, stalled and screened chancels for the lesser services, and so on. All these considerations lead us to imagine, that while the practical appearances are as Mr. Freeman faithfully pictures, this literary disregard of our *origines* by our earlier divines down to Cosin and Sparrow, may have been the result (partly, at all events) of policy, tempered also by an amount of traditional taking-for-granted, which we have lost, and not of mere neglect or ignorance. Unhappily, the tempest of the Civil War swept away the material work on which they had spent so much heart; and it so happened that the second school of the great seventeenth-century divines, persons who were young men at the Restoration, while giants in dogmatic learning, were either ignorant or careless of those ecclesiological proprieties which had engaged the intellect of an Andrews and a Cosin; and also, what is as likely, were frightened away from taking up their study, from a belief that it was these external manifestations, and not the unlucky political leaven of excessive prerogative notions, which had hurried on the crash out of which the Church was just emerging.

Accordingly, with the exception of some isolated facts, like Bishop Beveridge's defence of chancel screens, the later school has not contributed much towards the ecclesiological illustration of the signification of the Prayer-book. To these writers, then, Mr. Freeman's charge may be held to attach in its fulness.

It is curious, as we shall have occasion to point out more at length in a later part of this article, how much Mr. Freeman has thrown himself into the opposite extreme, and while he brings every store of ritual antiquity and literature to bear upon his

subject, he has almost entirely ignored the wide field of ecclesiastical illustration, a deficiency the more remarkable because he is himself, as is well known, neither averse from nor unversed in such studies.

Mr. Freeman's estimate of the 'school of Sparrow and L'Estrange,' and 'their successors, Comber, Nicholls, Wheatley, Bennet, Bisse, and others,' is thus expressed:—

'It is true, these learned writers were not altogether unacquainted with the older Offices of the Western Church; and they occasionally, though comparatively seldom, refer to them. But their line of comment, as all who are acquainted with them are aware, runs almost exclusively in the direction of the writings of the Fathers, the Councils, and the Holy Scriptures; or, again, in that of the successive alterations of detail which have taken place in the Services since the original revision in 1549. . . .

'The truth is, that these writers entertained so strong a distaste, and with it so entire a contempt, for whatever had been done or used in the middle ages of the Church, that the last thing likely to enter their minds, was to seek counsel or guidance of Services belonging to that period, however much they might take warning by them. They assumed, as a matter of course, and without much inquiry, that the changes made in 1549 amounted to nothing less than the composition of an entirely new set of Services out of the materials of the old, selected and recombined at pleasure on altogether a different plan and principle. The former structure was deemed by them to have been absolutely pulled down before the new one was erected. Whereas nothing is more remarkable in the original Preface to the revised Services, already referred to, than the utter unconsciousness which it manifests on the part of the revisers, of *having done anything more than revise*. Certain things taken away,—a certain fusing and consolidation of parts or elements heretofore disjointed and broken up,—certain provisions for securing that the Psalms and Lessons should be really and thoroughly *used*, and not skipped for the most part as in time past,—and the turning of the whole into English;—this was their entire idea of what they had done. They expected the people and Church of the day to accept the Services as essentially, and for all practical purposes, the same Services, revised;—and, what is more, as such the Church and people manifestly did accept them. So clear were the revisers on this point, that Cranmer (as Jeremy Taylor has recorded) offered to prove that "the order of the Church of England, set out by authority by Edward the Sixth, was the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years past." . . .

'Our commentators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, persist, as has been said, in viewing the men of the sixteenth as "composers" and "compilers" in the largest sense. Thus Wheatley (to name an author whose work embodies all the preceding ones, and exercises, in many respects not undeservedly, a very wide influence on the prevailing conceptions of our Offices) was indeed professedly not unaware of the real state of the case. Yet, after once admitting it, he ignores it throughout the rest of his book. Indeed, the account which he gives of the old Offices is so singular, as to lead to a suspicion that he had never even looked into the Daily Services: with the Communion Office he appears to have had a better acquaintance.'—Pp. 7—10.

The next step across the Sirbonian bog of the eighteenth, and part of the nineteenth century, leads us straight to our contemporaries, Messrs. Palmer, Maskell, Procter, and the careful trans-

lator of the Sarum Psalter, whose preface is signed 'J. D. C.,' 'ritualists of another stamp, and possessed with a juster idea of the exigencies of the case.' Upon the 'Origines Liturgicæ' of the first-named of these writers Mr. Freeman justly observes,—

'Attention has at length been forcibly and not unsuccessfully drawn towards the one quarter which had so long and so unaccountably been left unexplored, and from which alone a true idea of them can be obtained. The publication of the "Origines Liturgicæ" of Mr. Palmer is likely on this account to prove an epoch in the ritual literature of the English Church, only second in importance to that which was marked by the appearance of the Fifth Book of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Nor is it possible to speak of that work without rendering a deserved testimony to the perfect mastery which it exhibits over the vast range of ritual learning embraced by it, and to the clearness with which the results of the author's observation are set forth. . . .

'It might not unreasonably be supposed that these works, Mr. Palmer's more especially, must have exhausted the subject, and left little, if anything, to be done by others. But though Mr. Palmer, while leaving hardly any field of antiquarian investigation untrodden, has also paid especial attention to this one in particular, it must be confessed that the principal thing that needed to be done with reference to it is exactly that which he has left untouched. He has, indeed, carefully specified throughout, as has been said, the place which the successive features of our Services occupied in the older forms; and where any change or substitution has been made, has justified the arrangement—on the whole, felicitously—by precedents drawn from the ritual of other Churches. The entire collection, so to say, of ritual specimens embodied in our Offices has thus been labelled and registered; and its place in our own or other ancient collections can be easily ascertained. And this is a great gain, and one for which the student of our Services cannot be too grateful.

'Wherein then, it will be asked, is this work deficient as an exposition of those Services? I answer, first, in that it nowhere sets forth as a whole, in a lucid and connected view, in what degree, and with what modifications or developments, the old order and contents have been preserved in the remodelled Offices. From its failing to exhibit such a general *conspectus* as this, the work is not nearly so satisfactory or convincing as it might have been made. We do not rise from it with the impression that the parentage of our present Services, taken as a whole, can be successfully and legitimately traced to those which preceded them. When some particular feature or portion is noted as having been retained from the old forms, the circumstance has rather the air of a satisfactory incident, than of guaranteeing any real identity between the old and the new. The impression which the fact makes upon us is further weakened by its generally coming hand in hand with a variety of accidental correspondences,—for such, for the most part, they necessarily are,—fetched from remote sources, such as the Apostolical Constitutions, or the ancient Liturgies of Syria or of Armenia. . . .

'But this is not the only or the chief thing which Mr. Palmer's work has left still to be done. It was no part of his design to elicit the *spirit* and *meaning* either of the old Offices or of the New. More especially he has made no attempt to *penetrate and to state the true nature and character of the old Offices*, but has contented himself with a very brief and general account of their contents. It does not seem to have occurred to him that this, after all, was the great thing to be done in the matter. It is satisfactory, of course, to know that we use to a great extent the same substance and order of Services as our fathers did; but it would be a further and a more

important boon, if we could ascertain what *was the mind of those Services*.'—Pp. 11—15.

In extracting these criticisms of our author upon his predecessors in his own peculiar studies, we have inferentially shown the bent of his own mind and prepossessions. The remainder of his Introductory Chapter is mostly a recapitulatory anticipation of the subsequent treatise; and we shall therefore at once proceed to the body of the work, merely observing by the way, that the writer's earnest attachment to, and faith in the English Communion, is emphatically attested in the course of his remarks.

The first chapter of the first part is entitled 'On the Early and Primitive Form of Daily Service,' a consideration which Mr. Freeman rightly assumes to be indispensable towards appreciating what it was which S. Augustine introduced into England, which, as Mr. Freeman shows—

'was not, strictly speaking, the Roman Daily Offices at all, but only a kindred though very closely allied member of the family or stock of offices to which the Roman belonged.'—P. 41.

The first starting-point of our author is the disproof of a notion, which, strange to say, has gained more favour among English than Roman Catholic writers; several of the former assuming it without much study, while the latter, as well as Bingham, have by investigation been led to abandon it. This is the view, that in primitive times the celebration of the Holy Eucharist was daily. The second principal theme of our writer, is the proof that the daily service was of primitive, probably apostolic, antiquity, and not, as it has been sometimes taken for granted, the mere *detritus* of dropped Eucharists.

Mr. Freeman explains the comparative silence shown in the writings of the early Fathers upon religious assemblies, other than those for the celebration of the Eucharist:—

'And there seems to have been a peculiarity in the customs of the Church of the first two or three centuries (arising from the fewness of numbers in a diocese), which had the effect of giving a singular and overwhelming prominence to the Eucharistic service. It was this,—that the Bishop was commonly the celebrant at the Holy Communion; the priests, deacons, and laity—in a word, the whole body of the faithful within the diocese—being present. This is evidently the idea of Eucharistic celebration which S. Ignatius, writing in the beginning of the second century, has before his eyes in various passages of his Epistles. Thus, too, Clemens Romanus, in the first century, assumes the celebration to be a general gathering of this kind Now all this, while it exactly agrees with Justin Martyr's account in other respects, goes far to explain why he says nothing, in his Apology, of that secondary kind of service, which, being conducted probably for the most part by single presbyters, ministering to small bodies of the faithful, exhibited in altogether an inferior degree the great features of the Christian polity and worship.'—P. 44.

In the second section of the same chapter he resumes and amplifies this consideration:—

' Nothing can at first sight be much more dissimilar than the earliest and the latest phases which the ordinary services of the Church at large have assumed;—beginning with the simple and, though doubtless orderly, yet apparently free and unconfined devotions of the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem, of which we obtain glimpses through the Apostolic writings; and ending with the complex and minutely regulated Offices which have now prevailed for many hundred years alike in the East and in the West. And these Eastern and Western Offices, again, differ so materially from each other, that it has been concluded, and that by no mean judges, that there is absolutely no connexion between them; that "the Oriental rites" of ordinary service are, as to their derivation, "perfectly distinct from those of the Latin Churches." The truth is, however, first, that the ordinary and non-eucharistic worship of the Church was, as it should seem, far more organized, even in Apostolic days, than we are apt to suppose; and secondly, that the Offices of the East and West are both alike developments, though on different principles, and with characteristic variations as to structure and contents, of the earlier and simpler form of the Eastern rite.' —Pp. 46, 47.

The actual Eastern offices have, of course, like everything else Oriental, retained with a remarkable fidelity their resemblance to the earliest recorded services of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries; from which again Mr. Freeman looks to reconstruct the still more primæval methods of worship, the proofs of whose existence, according to his interpretation, he finds in a catena of references to them traceable in the earliest Christian writers; while in the next section he carries his investigation still further, and follows up analogies and more than probable sources of inspiration in the prayers and worship of the Jewish Church anterior to the Christian dispensation. The remaining four sections of this important chapter pursue the analysis of the principal morning and evening services of the Eastern Church, comprising Matins, Lauds, and Vespers (the long evening office corresponding to Compline being left for a later chapter), and points out the probable antiquity of each portion. While doing this, Mr. Freeman at the same time indicates the process by which the corresponding Latin services were moulded from them. The resemblances are very close, and the Greek forms have all the appearance in their internal structure (other considerations apart) of being the older. We wish we could give an abstract of this most interesting dissertation, but the attempt would involve us in an amount of writing for which neither we ourselves nor, are we certain, our readers would be prepared. And so we rather leave those students who are interested in the subject to Mr. Freeman's own pages. Our author, we should observe, does justice to the singular erudition of Mr. Neale's introduction to his *History of the Eastern Church*, as the book which had made the knowledge of Eastern worship generally accessible to readers of our own day.

The general impression left upon the mind by this examination

is, that although the Church services latterly became, in theory at least, sevenfold, yet that in fact they did usually group themselves, as ours do formally, into the morning and evening division, with this peculiarity, that the *night* service, called in later days of the Western Church 'Matins,' and partially represented in our own Morning Service, or 'Mattins,' for a long time fluctuated, while still performed at the strict hour of midnight, between being dealt with as a very late evening or a very early morning service. For instance, we find it (as Mr. Freeman elsewhere points out) at S. Benedict's epoch sometimes called by the name of *Vigiliæ*, the Lauds being styled *Matura*, or *Matutinæ*. The strange modern Roman custom of anticipation, which throws Matins back to three o'clock of the day before, is a sort of return, involuntary, nay grotesque, to this method of viewing it, with the absurdity of making the actual Vespers and Compline of the current day into a morning office. Our Church in Ireland, on the contrary, true to the love of extremes for which that island is famous, begins morning service in the majority of its parish churches at noon on Sunday. Upon week-days we have not exactly traced the prevalent hour.

Mr. Freeman, in a subsequent chapter, proves the much later, more private, and historic origin of the day hours, both in East and West, compared with those great services of mysterious and unknown antiquity.

It is a curious peculiarity of the Greek Offices, that the lections from Scripture and ecclesiastical writings, which form so prominent and so laudable an element of the Western Matins, and from which our own lessons are directly and acknowledgedly derived, should be entirely absent from them. Certain groups of short '*Odes*' are, however, sung in the Eastern Church as an accompaniment of the canticles, which are used at the 'Early Morning Service,' or Lauds, a service longer in that branch of the Church than the nocturnal one, and many of whose features have in fact been reproduced in the West, not at the analogous services, but in the Nocturns. These odes are generally *nine* in number, and divided into three triads, and from these Mr. Freeman very ingeniously traces the parentage of the Western lections, the odes (short compositions, as Eastern hymnology always is) being actually represented by the responsories; and the portions of Scripture to which the responsories reply, being an addition due to the practical mind of Western Christendom.

Again, in the East the Eucharistic Collect does not exist, although there are numerous short hymns of the nature of a collect, and the *prokeiménon*, or anticipation of the next ensuing epistle used in the Vesper service, strongly calls it to mind. To the West, however, was left the final work of conceiving a prayer

which should *collect* the teaching of the week's Gospel and Epistle, and by its joint use at both Eucharist and lesser services, serve as a bond of connexion between the two.

With this minute comparison of Eastern and Western Offices closes the first chapter. The second is general in its application, and deals with higher topics, no less than the theory of worship, viewed in its double form, as connected with and to be explained by the whole Christian scheme, the Incarnation and the Priesthood of our Blessed Lord, and the Sacramental system regarded in direct connexion with Him. Interesting as was the preceding chapter, full of most valuable information and patient investigation, this is far superior to it in the clearness and force with which its subject-matter is handled, for Mr. Freeman's style lends itself with greater freedom and vigour to synthesis than to analysis; a less friendly critic might call it desultory.

After some preliminary remarks, he starts with these questions :—

'Thus, then, our present inquiry assumes the phase of a comparison and discrimination between the lower and higher forms of Christian service and worship. The point for our consideration is, how comes this kind of service to be superadded to, and to co-exist with, the one principal and supreme act of Christian Ritual solemnly instituted by Christ Himself? Is it independent of the Eucharistic Rite, or supplementary to it? Does it, on the one hand, occupy a distinct ground of its own, a department of spiritual need altogether unprovided for in the Eucharist? And yet how can we conceive that that great act of Service, divinely ordained for the dedication and refection of man's nature, leaves any department of his being really undedicated or unprovided for? Or is this lower kind of service, on the other hand, purely ancillary to the higher; a branch proceeding from it; a tributary falling into it; and to be conceived of as always, and strictly, in subordination to it? This view, again, rigidly accepted, is by no means free from difficulty. Nor, I conceive, is it possible to attain to a satisfactory solution of the question before us, without taking a wider and more comprehensive view than might at first sight seem necessary, of the whole subject of the nature of Christian worship.'—Pp. 165, 166.

These inquiries lead to an exposition, thoughtful and striking, of the different aspect which our Lord's life and ministrations have, if regarded merely in the aspect of the Incarnation, or in that likewise of His continual Priesthood, upon which basis the relation respectively of the two Sacraments to these different aspects is pointed out :—

'Now these considerations account for a very peculiar feature, for such it is, in the economy of our salvation: I mean the *duality*, and not the *duality* merely, but wide diversity, of the Christian Sacraments; the distribution into two several and very different gifts, the Baptismal and the Eucharistic, of the estate which we have in Christ. Such a distribution, and such diversity, is a natural result of the twofold aspect which the saving actions of Christ themselves possess. Those actions being, under one aspect, purely re-creative, or restorative; under another, sacrificial and oblationary; are imparted (as to the virtue of them) to the one purpose in one Sacra-

ment, and to the other in the other. The Sacraments, the instruments of salvation, are fitted, in number and nature, to the twofold aspect of the one series of saving actions to which they owe their grace. Holy Baptism is so fashioned and empowered as to be the type and the instrument of simple re-creation and restoration; of the ethical readjustment which needed to be made, in order "to repair man that fell." The Holy Eucharist, again, is so fashioned and empowered as to be the type and the instrument of those sacrificial functions, both of oblation and participation, which form the crowning stage of man's exaltation in Christ. Renewal, in short, is but half the Christian's privilege; there is added the yet more marvellous and inscrutable mystery of his acceptable oblation of himself as a priest to God, and effectual participation, in the same character, of God. Baptism is the compendium and the instrument of the one privilege, the Eucharist of the other.—Pp. 174, 175.

This view is resumed and carried on in the second section:—

*The views stated in the preceding section, besides their bearing upon our present subject, furnish an answer to several inquiries which can hardly fail to force themselves upon thoughtful minds in reference to the Holy Sacraments. Such, for instance, as the question how there should be in both Sacraments an entire union to Christ, and yet the effects of the two Sacraments be different. For it might well seem, on a first view, that entire union to the same Person would always produce the same effects. And again, as to the real nature of the difference between the two Sacraments, and of the great preeminence, in point of awfulness and mysteriousness, universally accorded from the earliest times to the second Sacrament. It appears, from what has been said, that the difference is partly one of *degree* only, but that there is also a most important difference in *kind*. The Eucharist, under one point of view, and that its simpler and less transcendent one, is the making good and carrying on, by fresh supplies of the same kind of grace, of the renewal imparted in Baptism. Such is the account Hooker gives of the relation of the Sacraments to each other:—

"The grace which we have by the Holy Eucharist doth not begin but continue life. . . . Life being therefore proposed unto all men as their end, they which by Baptism have laid the foundation and attained the first beginning of a new life, have here their nourishment and food prescribed for continuance of life in them."

'Now even under this aspect the Eucharist may, in a certain sense, be said to transcend Baptism; so immense is the spiritual advancement which it is capable of imparting; so much so, indeed, that the analogy of food can hardly be said to represent the fact adequately. Food is by no means such a plenary gift to the body as the Eucharist is to the spiritual being. Perhaps the nearest analogy which the natural life presents is that of *growth*, more especially that degree of it which transforms infancy into manhood. This is so real a *multiplication*, so immense an exaltation, in all its parts and powers, of the infantile life as at first imparted, as not altogether inadequately to typify the vast accessions to the first-imparted baptismal life, which the Eucharist is capable of bestowing.'—Pp. 179, 180.

And further,—

'Whence, then, that peculiar character of profoundest and most revelational awe, with which the Church from the earliest ages has invested the mystery of the Holy Eucharist? Or whence,—if participation in order to growth is, as so many suppose, the whole purport of the Eucharistic act,—whence the very large proportion in which all ancient Eucharistic Offices are directed to those other great topics of Oblation or Dedication, and

Pleading? The view which represents the Eucharist as merely a means of making accessions, by way of growth, to the baptismal estate of grace, yields no account whatever of these great features in the ancient idea of the Eucharist. And yet some grounds there must be for this comparative estimate of the two Sacraments, which accords to the second a vast and unqualified preeminence over the first, both in point of solemnity, and also as an occasion for the discharge of certain spiritual functions of a Christian!

‘For though Baptism was held of old, as was fitting, in exceeding reverence; though it rightly enjoyed the lofty titles of “New Creation,” the “Anointing,” the “Gift,” “Illumination,” “Consecration,” and the like, yet the language applied to it is still as nothing, compared with what is said of the Eucharist. This is spoken of in very early days, as “the awful, the tremendous, the unspeakable mysteries,” “the hallowed, celestial, ineffable, stainless, terrible, tremendous, divine gifts.” The Eucharistic Presence of Christ, throughout the ancient Liturgies, or Communion Offices, is ever represented as something more awful and intimate than His Baptismal Presence; and warnings of proportionate solemnity have in all ages, after the example set by S. Paul, been used to deter men from partaking it unworthily.’—Pp. 181—183.

‘If Baptism possesses, as it does, “the shadow” of Christ’s Priesthood, the Eucharist has “the very image” of it. If Baptism makes us in power, and *de jure*, “priests unto God,” the Eucharist constitutes and exhibits us as such *de facto*, and in action. If Baptism makes us to be the spiritual Israel, God’s children and sons, supernaturally gathered into one Body, and sustained by various lower effluxes of the priestly and sacrificial work of the Aaron of the heavenly sanctuary; the Eucharist introduces us to the inner privileges of priestly action and participation, the antitypes in some sort of those by which Aaron’s seed was brought into a peculiar nearness to God, and partook of that bread of presence, and of those more eminent sacrifices, which were withheld from the rest. So much more intimate is the Eucharistic than baptismal Presence, Eucharistic than baptismal Participation, of Christ; even as the Israelitish priests stood in a more awful nearness to the presence of God than the people, and as eating, *e.g.* of the sin-offerings was a more solemn and privileged act than eating of the ordinary peace-offerings.’—P. 184.

The application of these considerations to the question of the need of some less awful service than the Eucharist for daily use is thus pressed:—

‘Now, in the first place, our observing that the Holy Eucharist, if we include all aspects of it, is of so sublime and transcendent a character, makes it reasonable or likely that there would be provided within the Church lower and simpler means of Divine worship and intercommunion. In proportion as the Eucharist is excellent and awful, admitting man to the very inner mysteries of his Christian estate, and so calls for the most intense concentration of his entire powers upon the discharge of his part in it; in that proportion is it unfitted to be the ordinary and continually applied, still less the exclusive instrument of spiritual intercourse between God and man.’—P. 186.

Mr. Freeman’s views upon the frequency of the celebration of the Holy Communion, to which we shall more particularly allude in the latter part of this article, are as follows:—

‘Now looking to those lessons, and that history, I venture to affirm, 1st, that the Holy Eucharist is *in its proper nature* a festival thing; by which

I mean a high, occasional, and solemn one, not every-day or common; and 2dly, that in the very earliest, and surely the wisest and holiest age, celebration, though never less than weekly, was rarely more frequent than that; never, that we know of for certain, (though at high seasons it may possibly have been so,) *daily*;—and that in these considerations, not in any *à priori* arguments as to the excellence of the rite, is to be laid the basis of a right estimate as to the frequency of celebration which is either to be expected or desired. *Sunday and festival celebration*, in a word,—a designation which leaves ample verge for diversity within certain intelligible limits,—may safely be affirmed to be, as a general rule, the prescript for the Church, and to exhibit with the greatest fidelity the true character and purpose of the Holy Eucharist. That the clergy may have occasion to celebrate much more frequently than this, publicly or privately, as a part of their ministrations to the people, is of course undeniable. And that this measure may be in different degrees exceeded by clergy and laity alike, even to the degree of daily celebration at particular times, is conceded also. But that whensoever and wheresoever this is the case, it is the bringing in a Festival, *i.e.* a high and solemn idea and character, into the common and average tenor of the life of Christians,—that it is the elevation of the Christian life into an uncommon condition of privilege, and one not designed for them as a general rule,—this I would affirm no less.—Pp. 187, 188.

The third section starts with the obvious ‘corollary,’ or rather with a more stringent repetition of the argument, that the ‘existence of some kind of ordinary service’ is ‘necessary,’ from the ‘comparative infrequency’ of the Eucharist:—

‘Thus, then, Public Worship, as discharged by the Ordinary Offices of the Church, is far indeed from being, as some have imagined, an act of merely natural piety. Neither is it, as others perhaps conceive it, a Christian function indeed, yet an isolated thing, having no particular relation to the Sacraments, or occupying ground for which no provision is made, compendiously or otherwise, in these ordinances. The account to be given of Christian Public Worship—of the existence of such a thing at all—is, that it is strictly complementary to the Sacraments in the sense above explained. Complementary to them, I say, as filling up their idea; not supplementary, as if adding anything to it. To refer to the never-failing archetypal analogy of the Body of Christ: as “it pleaseth Him in mercy to account Himself incomplete and maimed without us,” the Church being the necessary “filling up” or “complement” of Him “Who filleth all in all;” so is the Christian life in general, but Public Worship in particular, and in an especial degree, the “filling up” of the scheme or idea of the Sacraments. And of both Sacraments: not, as a third opinion would make it, of one only, that of Baptism; a view which is often more or less explicitly put forth, even in the improved theological teaching of the present day. That it is the acting out of that Sacrament, and may at all times be most properly used as such, has been fully admitted, and is to be most earnestly maintained. But its aspect towards the other Sacrament must be no less clearly held and contended for. To disallow a close connexion as capable of existing between ordinary worship and the Eucharist, must appear on the slightest reflection most unsatisfactory. Of the two, indeed, it stands in more obvious connexion with this than with Baptism; the work of prayer, praise, and of receiving knowledge of divine mysteries, being more strikingly akin to the Eucharistic action of conscious and active oblation and participation, than to that more passive and often unconscious process renewal, of which Baptism is the instrument.

'The Ordinary Worship of the Church, then, to state briefly the conclusion from our premises, is an eminent means of discharging the obligations and functions imposed, and of receiving the benefits guaranteed, in both the Sacraments. But its peculiar character is, that it is an exercise, in a lower way, of that Christian priesthood which we have in Christ, which is given to us in a measure in Baptism, but only bestowed in its fulness, or exercised in its highest form, in the celebration of the Eucharist.'—Pp. 202, 203.

This 'adjustment between the Church's greater and lesser acts of worship' seems, as Mr. Freeman observes, the 'proper antidote to a tendency which has begun to appear here and there amongst us, to depreciate the Church's ordinary worship, if not 'to desire even the partial abolition of it.' Persons there are who, 'rightly impressed with the transcendent excellence of the Eucharistic rite,' in their consequent zeal for its more frequent celebration, 'look at the Church's ordinary offices with toleration at best.' Mr. Freeman, doubtfully supposing the existence of, and then passing over unanswered those amongst this class who would even advocate the extreme and Roman view of general uncommunicate attendance, replies to those who 'would desire 'the substitution of a daily and genuine congregational Eucharist 'for an ordinary office of Morning Prayer:—

'This view, as expressing a zeal for the one act of worship instituted by our Lord Himself, is naturally engaging to devout and reverent minds. But it leaves out of sight, on the one hand, certain limiting and restraining facts adduced above, which render it likely—nay, which prove with the force of a moral demonstration—that daily Eucharistic celebration was not the intended rule for the Church's observance; such as the absence, acknowledged by all learned men who have examined the subject, of such frequency during apostolic and early times; the declension of Christianity under the condition of daily celebration; and the high festival character of the rite itself. And again, on the other hand, this expression of zeal for the Eucharist ignores the position, dignity, and powers of the Ordinary Worship of the Church.'—P. 206.

However, as Mr. Freeman most truly states, the 'danger' of 'perhaps the vast proportion of the English Church, both lay and clerical, lies in the opposite direction;' the 'acquiescence in infrequent celebration of the Holy Communion,' under which word '*infrequent*,' as we are glad to find by other portions of the book, *monthly* celebrations are included and implied:—

'This subject will be treated of hereafter; I will only point out here, with reference alike to Sunday and week-day Ordinary Offices, that in Apostolic times, the idea of their standing alone, or superseding the weekly Eucharist, was absolutely unknown.'—P. 207.

These views, our author considers, might lead the way to 'something like an agreement' upon 'an important theological difference in the present day:—

'The assertion of certain real priestly functions as peculiar to the clergy, and specially of a commission to consecrate and administer the Holy

Eucharist, is the distinguishing note of one large and influential school within the English Church. The assertion, again, of a Christian priesthood as appertaining to the laity, has been taken up as an antagonistic truth in other quarters.—P. 207.

The priesthood of the laity is thus vindicated against those who are unmindful of it:—

‘The one, in maintaining the power, undoubtedly pertaining to the clergy, to consecrate and administer the Holy Eucharist, have perhaps been too little careful to represent them as, (1) essentially and entirely ministerial under the Great High-Priest, whose Hand, as it were, they are and as also, (2) needing the concurrent action of the people; *not without whom*, as necessary consentients and coadjutors, they perform that sacred function. Such is unquestionably the view of the early Church as expressed in her Liturgies. “Be present, be present, O Jesu, Thou good High-Priest, in the midst of us, as Thou wert in the midst of Thy disciples,” (*i.e.* at the original institution,) “and sanctify this Oblation, that we may by the hands of Thy holy Angel receive that which is sanctified,” are the words of one very ancient Communion Office, and correctly represent the mind of all. And again, it is priest and people united that make the solemn oblation of the Elements, call down the grace of the Holy Spirit upon them, and plead the merits of the One all-prevailing Sacrifice. It is in the plural number, in the congregational form, that these great transactions between heaven and earth take place. Above all, it is in the presentation, yet more by themselves than by the clergy, of an acceptable people,—acceptable in Christ, and as the Body of Christ,—that the glory of that great Offering consists. The holocaust that flames on the altar, “the sweet savour acceptable to the Lord,” is “themselves, their souls and bodies, a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice.” In the power thus concurrently with the clergy to offer and plead, and finally to participate, the Christian priesthood of the people formally and essentially consists.’—Pp. 208, 209.

Of course this view is not only compatible with, but the necessary complement of the fullest acceptance of, what is currently called the Apostolical succession; but

‘Those, on the other hand, who are so earnest in maintaining the existence and the rights of Christian priesthood as pertaining to the people, are in general very far from entertaining any just or adequate conception of what priesthood is. For this they must have recourse to the ancient teaching of the Church, embodied in her Communion Offices, and thoroughly confirmed by Scripture. They must in their turn be willing to learn much on this point from those whom they now look upon as enthusiasts or upholders of priestcraft. Let them accept and realize, first, the verity of the PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST, and especially its intimate connexion with the original institution of the Eucharist; next, the continuation of that priestly operation of His on earth by the hands of His ministers, as in heaven by His own; and lastly, the priestly character of even the people’s part in that most exalted function of humanity, the great Eucharistic Transaction. Then, but not till then, they will believe in a “lay priesthood” worth upholding. At present, it must be plainly said, their view is for the most part a purely rationalistic one; a mere negation of the gifts and powers of the Gospel; a casting down of the ladder between heaven and earth, with all its array of ascending and descending ministries, in order to substitute for it the efforts of all but unaided natural piety. Those who entertain this view, while professedly looking to the grace of God, do in reality seek

to cut the Church off from the guaranteed reservoirs and channels of that grace: those reservoirs being the Incarnation and the Priesthood of Christ; those channels, the Sacraments ordained by Him. Would that such could be brought to see that, in their zeal against a ministering priesthood, they really arrive at a position which evacuates the Gospel, for clergy and people alike, of its best gifts and privileges! and that it is through the instrumentality of such a duly empowered priesthood, and no otherwise, that the Christian scheme provides a true and worthy priesthood for the people of God.'—Pp. 210, 211.

With this too true representation of the opinions (doctrines we can hardly call them) of that party before our eyes, we fear that any hopes of an accommodation without something much more explicit than an assumed and tacit modification of views on its part, must remain among the many propositions which, easy as they are upon paper, present vast difficulties in practice. Of course, the party itself may wane away and disappear out of the English Church, from pure want of efficient recruits to a cause so unattractive to enlightened piety and humble-minded knowledge. In this contingency the accommodation will become unnecessary, from there no longer being two sides to bring together.

The third and next chapter of the treatise leads us to that which initiates what, as we have stated, is the second main topic of the volume. Its heading runs, 'On the Structure and Spirit of the Ancient English Offices;' and the chapter, of course, starts from that re-casting of the Offices at the period of the secular triumph of Christianity, which has been currently taken, by Roman Catholic and other writers, to be the epoch of their first evolution.

But, as a preliminary step, the discussion again reverts to Oriental antiquity, for the rise and progress of the lesser day offices of the first, third, sixth, and ninth hours, and that which in the West is termed *Completorium*, and in the East is known by the more practical if less poetical name of the 'After Supper' (*ἀποδειπνον*) service. Of these Prime is specially called a '*novella solemnitas*' of his own day by Cassian, writing about A.D. 420, and, indeed, as having been set up in S. Jerome's monastery at Bethlehem, of which he was himself a member, and thence propagated, probably by his own influence, in the West. The *ἀποδειπνον* contains a 'prayer-like hymn for protection against the perils of darkness, which is evidently the original of that collect in the Sarum (but *not* in the Roman) Compline, so familiar to us as the Third Collect of our own Evensong. These considerations bring us to the next section, which is more immediately connected with the second period of the Western Offices, in whose elaboration, as Mr. Freeman ingeniously marshals the evidence, Cassian seems likely, from the circumstances of his life, to have borne an influential part, both towards the completion of the Roman books, from his friendship with S. Leo, and of the

Gallican, with which, from his being in later life an abbot at Marseilles, he was peculiarly connected. This Gallican ritual Mr. Freeman concludes to have been the origin of the English services, which were thus a sister, not a daughter, ritual of the Roman, other Western rituals being, so to speak, cousins. Our readers will remember that Venerable Bede preserves the letter of S. Gregory the Great to S. Augustine, directing him not necessarily to follow the Roman usages as such, but to select whatever he found best anywhere. Now, S. Augustine spent some time at Marseilles (Cassian's own residence, a little more than a century and a half previously) on his journey, while, between his two visits to England, he went to Arles, and was there consecrated; therefore his having adopted the Gallican ritual in accordance with his patron's advice is most probable. We remember that in one of his earlier works Mr. Pugin, a Roman Catholic, draws the same inference as to the *avtapkeia* of the English services from the same letter of S. Gregory. To this Gallic descent from Cassian, Mr. Freeman traces the greater resemblance of the old English services to the Oriental than he can find in the Roman forms. Cassian in compiling the latter, he argues, was hampered by the preexisting customs of the Patriarchal City, while in Gaul his Eastern prepossessions would be unfettered.

Mr. Freeman here introduces a defence of our Church's right to have altered her services at the Reformation, founded upon these early precedents, which we think it was hardly necessary to have brought, as few of the readers for whom this book is intended would specifically require it. The argument is not systematic enough for Roman Catholics, and no Anglican can need it, except in some more technical form, to use in self-defence. We all know, indeed, that the various French dioceses changed their breviaries in the seventeenth and last centuries. The Roman *lis* with us is not as to the bare fact of our having made changes, but as to the reason why, and the manner in which we did so, and what the result was. The adroit controversialist of that Church would deal with this portion of Mr. Freeman's book, not by denying his facts, but by observing that the then Popes, of course, sanctioned what was done, just as they have in all ages sanctioned diversities of breviaries in different countries, or among different monastic bodies. At present, the feeling among Ultramontanes is strongly in favour of iron conformity to the Roman Breviary, and hence the distinctive uses in mostly all the various French dioceses have, within the last fifteen years, been replaced by the model book of Rome—a change the less to be wondered at, from the fact that the abrogated forms were, however well intentioned as simplifications, neither valuable for

antiquity, nor compiled with as much taste or judgment as they might have been; the majority, in fact, being the work of the corrupt and sentimental eighteenth century, the rest of the seventeenth. But the anti-Gallican restorers of these days never dared attack those books with the argument, that had the Pope and the Roman congregation of rites cordially approved their use, they would not have been quite *en règle*. The ground taken was, that the Pope did *not* so approve; that they were innovations of Gallican impertinence and insubordination, and even now, we believe, the unwritten deviations from the standard Roman Breviary are allowed by the most rigid Papal conformist.

We may take this opportunity of observing, with reference to Mr. Freeman's whole book, that it would have been in many places benefited by greater compression. The form in which he has thrown his argument leads him often to travel over substantially the same ground, at a distance from his former discussion of the identical topics, which should have called for their being disposed of either in one or in the other place. The Easter offices are viewed in the light of their relation to the English Prayer-book. We find the latter again illustrated by Eastern parallels which had already been elucidated. A revision of the manuscript in this sense would have greatly added to the clearness of the volume as a manual of reference, and to its force as a treatise of constructive argument: while it would have afforded space, (without augmentation of the bulk of matter,) for those considerations to which, as we shall see, sufficient attention has not been called.

Among the incidental notices which are interspersed in this section, is the curious fact, that while in the West the whole 95th Psalm has been constantly used as the invitatory to Matins, the Eastern Church represents it by an abbreviated form, composed, however, out of the Psalm. We may remark, by the way, that the compilers of the American Prayer-book have, in their treatment of this invitatory, exhibited a curious, and of course unintentional, analogy to the system of the unreformed Church, of forming responsories and antiphons out of portions of poetic Scripture, strung together. Their precedent, probably, was the still existing use of privately compiled anthems (antiphons) in the Church of England, so put together. Accordingly, in lieu of the 95th Psalm entire, as we and all the other Western Churches have it, there occurs in their Prayer-book what the preceding rubric styles an Anthem (*i.e.* antiphon), headed '*Venite exultemus Domino*,' and composed, not uningeniously, of the first seven verses of the 95th Psalm, and of the two verses—

'O worship the Lord in the beauty, &c.

'For He cometh, for He cometh,' &c.

after which the next rubric permits to be said or sung (or not said or sung, at the clergyman's discretion) either the '*Gloria Patri*' or the '*Gloria in excelsis*,' which is permitted, across the Atlantic, to be used alternatively with the simpler form, the use of one or other being obligatory at the conclusion of the last of the daily psalms. The American Church, moreover, provides special invitatories for the other days besides Easter, on which special psalms are appointed, the use of which is contingent on one of the permissive 'Selection' being used instead of the Proper Psalms.

The third section contains a sort of recapitulation of the argument as far as it has gone. We wish we had space to extract a very felicitous comparison of the practical character of the Prime Service, compared with the merely meditative Matins, and Lauds which occupy the intermediate position. We quote, however, its concluding passage, which is, indeed, marked off as a special *τόπος*, and which describes, with considerable breadth and pregnancy, the distinctive characters of the East and West, as shown in their respective services:—

'It will not be uninteresting to endeavour briefly to discriminate in this place the genius of the East and of the West, as exhibited in their respective forms of ordinary worship which we have now passed under review, more especially as our present Offices combine, in a measure, the temper and characteristics of both.

'The East, then, if we leave out of the account those enrichments which her ordinary Offices derive from the Eucharist on Sundays and Festivals, and take her, so to speak, in her every-day dress, is more uniform and unchanging; the West more multiform and variable. Witness the single, changeless Invitatory and Benediction of the one Church, and their endless varieties in the other. While the West rings countless changes, according to the season, on the same essential idea, the East prolongs it in one unvaried and majestic toll, from the beginning to the end of the year. The East, again, is more rapt, the West more intellectual. The East loves rather to meditate on God as He is, and on the facts of Christian doctrine as they stand in the Creed; the West contemplates more practically the great phenomena of Christian psychology, and the relations of man to God. The East has had its Athanasius, and its Andrew of Crete; the West its Augustine and Leo. Hence psalms and hymns in more profuse abundance characterise the Eastern; larger use and more elaborate adaptations of Scripture, the Western Offices. The East, by making the Psalms all her meditation, seems to declare her mind that praise is the only way to knowledge; the West, by her combined Psalm and lection system, that knowledge is the proper fuel of praise. While the East, again, soars to God in exclamations of angelic self-forgetfulness, the West comprehends all the spiritual needs of man in Collects of matchless profundity; reminding us of the alleged distinction between the Seraphim who love most, and the Cherubim who know most. Thus the East praises, the West pleads; the one has fixed her eye more intently on the Glory-Throne of Christ, the other on His Cross. Both alike have been dazzled and led astray by the wondrous accidents of the Incarnation. Finally, the East has been more inquisitive and inventive in the departments both of knowledge and praise; the West, more constructive, has wrought up, out of scattered Eastern

materials, her exhaustive Athanasian Creed, and her matchless *Te Deum*.
—Pp. 273, 274.

The fourth chapter brings us still more close to present questions, as it discusses 'the structure and significance of the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer;' and accordingly commences with a passage, the import of which we seriously press upon the attention of those excellent persons, whose peace of mind may be disturbed by a comparison between the Roman and English offices, especially should they know the English services through their actual performance, and the Roman (for the Sarum they have probably never touched,) through the neat little volumes coming from M. Hanicq's press at Mechlin, and looking as if they really were the Book of Common Prayer of the Continental Western Church. We give the most important portions of this passage:—

'In turning now at length to take a more connected view of our existing services, seen in the light of the preceding inquiry, we are met by one very practical and indeed paramount consideration. It is this; that, as far as the Western Church at least is concerned, we herein take off our eyes from an extinct and buried past, to fix them on a living and an energizing present. Whatever the abstract difference between our ordinary service and that of all other Churches of the West; however to our disadvantage, in point of largeness, beauty, or the like;—in practice the great difference is this,—that the one speaks, the other (with exceptions not worth naming, either as compared with the bulk of the services as a whole, or with the extent of Western Christendom) is silent. To what purpose is it, as regards these services themselves, that I or any other should dwell on their glorious proportions, or trace their old and ennobling descent, or exhibit the exquisite skill with which they are harmonized to express the emotions, or inform the life of Christian men? The goodly edifice is in ruins; the noble race is extinct; the exquisite harmony has ceased. Though the eloquence, of a Chrysostom or a Bernard should be expended on these topics, it would answer no spiritual and practical purpose whatsoever: no one's devotion, speaking broadly, would be the better for it. The life, that is, the living use, of those once animated and still beautiful forms, has passed away, apparently for ever. Some of them, as the Gallican and the Spanish, have been extinct for a thousand years, and survive but in the merest fragments. Others, as the Roman and the Milanese, exist as the devotions of the clergy, but of them alone. The Churches, whose devotions they nominally are, have long given over the struggle which for ages, with whatever success, they maintained, against the tendency to decay innate in services so numerous and complex, as well as unvernacular, and therefore uncongregational and unpopular. In truth, as we have already seen, the Offices of the Western Church, such as they continued from the sixth and the sixteenth century, were by their origin, and also in the general cast and scheme of them, monastic, and bear the marks of this deeply impressed upon their structure.'

'Let it be understood, then, that the noble scheme of services we have been contemplating is a thing of the past, and of which none that we know of desire or attempt the revival. Other aims engross the mind of the continental Churches; as 'Benediction,' or other newly-devised services; not Matins or Lauds, Prime or Compline. Even Vespers, the sole relic of the great system, is the object of earnest and uncompromising attack by

the most advanced section of Romanists. The study, therefore, of the Western scheme of Offices in its old form, is the study of a dead language. The inquiry into it is strictly an antiquarian one. Regarded as a public Service of the Church, there is, it may be said, no such thing anywhere now. Let this be distinctly realized: it is of the utmost moment, in its influence upon the spirit in which we approach the subject of the present chapter. Let it be clearly apprehended that the Churches, the congregations of Christian men and women, who use these ancient and grand services, nowhere exist. *Sundays or week-days*, no such tide of psalmody as we have been contemplating flows to the glory of God; no such adoring meditation on Holy Scripture occupies the hours whether of night or day; no *Te Deum* sums up the meditation or the praise; no *Lauds* salute the return of day with mixed notes of penitence and joy, or awaken resurrection memories or hopes; no *Prime* pleads for pardon, or prays for guidance; no *Credo* is uttered as with one voice and heart; no *Collect* gathers into it the Eucharistic association of the passing week or season. The curious and exquisite devices of ever-varying *Invitatory*, *Antiphon*, and *Responsory*; the several doctrinal associations beating as pulses through the different offices,—these no longer quicken or guide the devotions of any. All this was done once, we hardly know when: all we do know is that it is not done now. In one country alone, in one form alone, does the ancient Western Office really survive. Psalmody, Scripture, responsive *Canticles*, *Preces*, *Collects*, the media of Europe's ancient worship, banished from all other lands, have taken refuge in the Churches of the English Communion. The English Church is in this matter the heir of the world. She may have diminished her inheritance; but all other Western Churches have thrown it away. The question is really between these ordinary offices and none:—

“Quod querimus, hic est,
Aut nusquam.”—Pp. 275—279.

There is, of course, a certain amount of rhetorical amplification in this. We have, for example, ourselves been present when the shorter offices were said by accumulation, at S. Geneviève in Paris, (a church in which attention has been paid to a certain reform,) at an hour, (9 A.M.), and in a tone of voice admitting of the cooperation of such lay folk as knew Latin (not that we observed on this occasion any one who did follow them). Vespers also on Sundays and Festivals, seem, although attacked, to live on, at least in the northern Roman Catholic countries. And we should be sorry to predicate that, in despite of the Oratorian movement, the revival of zeal which has certainly permeated the Roman communion, may not have also tended to make Vespers better attended by the laity than they were in the last century, when all earnestness seemed at its last gasp. Still, however, with these limitations, which justice compels us to point out, we believe that Mr. Freeman's trenchant statement broadly represents the approximate fact as it concerns the general millions of lay Christians of the Western communion. In confirmation of this view, he quotes a passage from the recently published pamphlet upon ‘*Divine Service*,’ by Mr. Perceval Ward, a very intelligent writer, enabled by a lengthened sojourn in Italy to speak authoritatively upon the state of matters there. The pre-

servation of the offices sung publicly in choir is, he states, felt as a burden in the Italian cathedrals and monasteries :—‘ Sunday Vespers, as a congregational service joined in by the laity, are ‘ an exception in some countries, but not even there in Italy.’ ‘ The laity are absolutely ignorant of the Psalms. The seven ‘ Penitential Psalms are all that are known among them (the ‘ Italians). In France and England the Sunday Vesper Psalms ‘ are also known.’ The fact which Mr. Freeman states in a note, and which of course rests upon his authority, that the Oratorians (the known leaders in the new Roman ways of worship) *will* not use their breviary in choir for their own obligatory recitation, lest they should thereby encourage the ancient system, is curious and significant.

In further confirmation of this popular oblivion of the ‘ Saints’ Prayer-book ‘—the Psalter—we have before us now a little cheap volume of vernacular Roman Catholic worship, in one of its most fashionable modern forms, ‘ The Devotions and Office of the ‘ Sacred Heart of our Lord,’ &c., including the ‘ Devotion to the ‘ Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary,’ &c. published in Dublin in 1846. The book is partly narrative and argumentative, partly devotional; and under the latter head includes vernacular prayers and liturgies, and a novena. Besides this, at the end of the volume are given, in English, ‘ The Little Office to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour, J. C.’ and the Latin ‘ Officium Stmi. Cordis D. N. J. C.’ The latter is a regular Breviary Service for one day, with Psalms, &c. as usual, and nine lections in the nocturns. The vernacular ‘ Little Office ’—very little indeed in its bulk!—has neither psalm nor lecture, nor even capitulum, though it is composed of a short form of worship for every canonical hour, comprising versicles, responsories, and some prayers, besides a metrical hymn for each, with the following response to all in lieu of a *Gloria*:—

‘ Thy Father’s only one,
Chaste spouse of lovers pure,
Who canst no rival love endure,
Possess our hearts alone.’

After the Latin Officium occurs a translation of the Hymns, and of the Lessons from S. Bernard given in it, but not a word in explanation of its Psalms or the Lections from Holy Scripture. The ‘ Little Office,’ in short, is no office at all, in the proper sense of the word.

Mr. Freeman tabulates (as he had previously done in the case of the Eastern services) the ancient English *offices*, (‘ services’ rather, talking of England, where *servitium* always stood for the Roman *officium*,) for Matins, Laud, and Prime, in three columns, and in a distinct fourth column, the ‘ Revised office’ (service), showing what portions it has borrowed for ‘ Morning Prayer’ from each,

and in what comparative sequence; for from these our 'Mattins' (to borrow the alternative designation, curiously not once alluded to by our writer, though given in our Prayer-book in the Calendars, and for which we are not ashamed to own a predilection) are compiled, the concluding benediction alone being referable to Tierce, of which it forms the *capitulum*. A similar table connects 'Evening Prayer,' or 'Evensong,' with the old Vespers and Compline.

A curious illustration of the 'process by which our present form may have evolved itself' is drawn from the series of Primers for Private Devotion from 1545 down to 1575, in which year, deep in Elizabeth's reign, appeared the last edition, still retaining the old divisions of Matins, Lauds, &c. 'But, meanwhile, (viz. in 1564,) appeared a highly modified form of it in Latin, expressly reducing the services to two, under the titles of *Preces Matutinæ* and *Vespertinæ*.' This volume, though in the main proceeding on the same principles of revision as those characterising the public Prayer-book, was 'markedly independent in many points, and, as it were, belonged to an earlier stage of evolution'—*e. g.* it has a marked break at, and commencement of, Lauds. Antiphons are retained, though only one to each group of Psalms, which are, like those of the older services, fixed not rotatory, and hymns occur in the old places. In a combination of this system with the actual Prayer-book, Mr. Freeman sees the theoretic (for, as we shall observe, his practical policy is *quieta non movere*) 'simplicity of the means required for bringing about a greatly increased resemblance between' the actual and the older services—*i. e.* by 'introducing, immediately after the Te Deum or Benedicite, a small group of Laud and Prime 'Psalms'—and, of course, letting the congregation deal with the modified service in the same spirit of division, by either attending both portions, or by going out and coming in at either, as they preferred. A similar scheme would mark out Vespers and Compline.

The second section treats of the Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution. We cannot, we own, go with Mr. Freeman in his admiration for the Exhortation. It is, no doubt, most excellent in its tone and statements, and Eastern precedent can be found for it. But our bustling countrymen, and the dreamy meditative Orientals, require different handling. We do not either say that at the first translation of the services into the vernacular, something of the sort may not have been requisite to clear the way for a more than lip use of the confession, as if it were the hurried 'confiteor' of other days. But as things now are, knowing this exhortation as we all do by heart, we fear that its chief practical result is either to import a tedium into the service, or to be considered (a light in which we fancy many even of

the most regular and steady-minded attendants at daily service do view it) as a happy expedient for giving two minutes more law to the worshipper anxious not to lose the confession. Whether, after this over-candid acknowledgment of feeling, we should in practice recommend the *status in quo* of the Prayer-book to be thrown open for the sake of revising this or any other exhortation, is quite an independent question, and one upon which we shall have to say more hereafter.

In Mr. Freeman's defence of this composition, we trace the indications of a tendency to optimism, which, but for his critical powers and spirit of research, might have often led him astray. It is surely enough to express general satisfaction at our services being what they are, without seeking to vindicate each separate portion absolutely. For example, we think Mr. Freeman will find few to agree with him in his excessive admiration of the grandiose phraseology of the Collect for the Sovereign. Some critics would even urge that this tendency might have tempted Mr. Freeman, had he been an American Churchman, and writing his book for the use of the Church across the Atlantic, to extend his argument to the vindication of such changes as the dropping of the Athanasian Creed, the Magnificat, and the Nunc Dimittis; or the alteration, out of deference to mere vulgar prudery, of one of the most beautiful verses in the Te Deum, not to talk of the option in the Apostles' Creed. Many good Churchmen in the United States are, we believe, fearful of moving for the restoration of the treasures thus cast away, lest the opening up of the Prayer-book might lead to further changes in the downward direction. But they do not the less regret the privation. Happily, our Prayer-book *is* a composition which we can contemplate with complacency and gratitude. But let us, therefore, beware of seeming to endeavour to be making the best of a bad thing, by assuming an optimist tone in reference to it. The Prayer-book has enough of enemies on both sides, who will strive to damage it by turning such a tone of ours to ridicule.

The chief obvious deficiency which the revision of the Prayer-book has left to be made up, is the absence of any body of additional devotions for the use of such clergy and other persons as, either from their living in community, or from ill health, or from the wish to avoid idleness in a religious way, without the pre-occupations of specific active work, or finally from the strongly stamped individual vocation of devotional temperament, can and desire to use *formalized* offices of religion supplementary to Mattins and Evensong. While, as Mr. Freeman argues, the unreformed churches have run to an excess of length in their canonical hours which has defeated its own object, and practically strangled the entire system, our Church (as it stands)

falls short the other way. That, however, this shortening was not in the *mind* in the Reformation, is self-evident by the above referred-to series of Primers, extending over so many years of our reformed existence; while Bishop Cosin's Devotions for the Canonical Hours take up the chain at a later date. The truth is, we suppose, that the Primer, legally speaking, though obsolete, is in no way abrogated, but may still be considered as, in a sense, a book having authority. However, its private use would be cumbersome, inasmuch as it travels over the same ground of Mattins and Evensong as the Prayer-book, which must, as a practical fact, be accepted wholly to stand for the earliest and later worship, while the supplementary forms come in for intermediate times. After all, with a good will, and an Episcopate alive to the need, the deficiency can be met without any interference which would necessitate the meddling of Parliament, through the Act of Uniformity being touched, Convocational sanction being quite another matter. The supplementary hours would be always for the use, mainly, of communities, theological or other colleges, hospitals, penitentiaries, and so on; and the adaptation of oratories to these buildings, to be employed for their own private worship, is daily becoming more recognised, more visibly assimilated to the actual Church system. As, then, it does become thus recognised, and as our Bishops admit—and, in admitting, supervise—such oratories and hour services, so will the risk of those dangers be avoided, which seemed likely to attend the novelty when their establishment was a matter of private, and, in some cases, almost secret venture, and when the services used in them wore the aspect of being antagonistic, rather than ancillary, to the recognised use of the English communion. Rigid uniformity of use in these forms of devotion throughout the Church is, of course, unattainable without the formal sanction of the Church authorities acting corporately. But neither is it necessary—not even, perhaps, desirable. There is a uniform public use of Mattins and Evensong, confirmed by the most stringent enactments of Church and State. This is the main thing. Freedom may surely be allowed in the private and supplementary devotions of smaller communities, and of their exceptional congregations, even to the extent, it might be, of each adapting its form to its own specific needs. If, on the whole, these various compilations correspond generally with the type of ancient devotions inherited by the whole Church, this is all we ought to be careful about. Pressing more tightly would be to defect from that principle of freedom and moderation, which we claim as the distinguishing characteristic of the English Reformation. In the restriction of such offices to oratories, and the retention of the church for the regular services, we have our

safeguard that they shall not supersede the higher obligation. This danger was indeed, as far as the State could meddle, rendered imminent for a short time, last session of Parliament, by that Liberty of Religious Worship Bill, which, intended as it was for the benefit of Dissenters in the cloak of Churchmen, yet opened the door to anarchy of all descriptions. In its amended form, however,—thanks to the vigilance of a few lords spiritual and temporal,—it just relieves the impediments which prevented our Bishops and Clergy from placing supplementary worship on its proper footing, and yet provides against a rival being set up against the parish church, within the 'Establishment,' and yet caparisoned in the garb of Geneva or of Rome.

Mr. Freeman considers, and we think correctly, that the expression in the Rubric preceding the absolution, 'To be pronounced by the priest *alone*,' is intended to show that it is not to be said as the unreformed absolution was, 'interchangeably, with the exception of the last clause, by priest and people;' and not to express, as is sometimes supposed, that no deacon is to use the absolution. This does not at all imply that there is the least authority for supposing that our Prayer-book gave any such power to the deacon who might happen to officiate,—just the reverse; for, as Mr. Freeman remarks, 'it is infinitely improbable that the possibility of his doing so ever crossed the revisers' minds.'

The third, fourth, and fifth sections of the chapter being the examination of our ordinary Morning and Evening services to their conclusion, we could say much upon all the points raised. The difficulty is to say little; and we have already extended our remarks so much, that we rather hurry on to the concluding chapter, only remarking, that we reserve one or two considerations, which have presented themselves to us, for hereafter.

Among the principal topics which engage Mr. Freeman's attention in the conclusion—the conclusion, be it recollected, only of the first part—is that of projected alterations, which he is opposed to, while, as we shall see, willing to meet the need by the simpler course of division. One remark of his deserves particular quotation, from the home truth which it tells, most pregnantly worded, as a reason against the abridgement of the daily service which has gained favour in quarters where disaffection to the Prayer-book can certainly not be predicated. He pleads to have 'the English Church saved the apparent discredit of proclaiming that her services, already the shortest in Christendom, are yet longer than she knows how to use.' It is better to be reminded betimes from the pen of a friend of this inevitable taunt, than for us, as things are, after attempting to make our non-Sunday services shorter and more easy than

they are, through any other expedient than the allowable one of the separate use of the litany, to find we have only succeeded in dissipating our Catholic heritage, without having gained the compensating advantage of bringing our millions within the Church doors upon the working days.

As might be inferred from what we have just said, Mr. Freeman's views upon the much-vexed question of the day—the *status in quo*, or the reverse of our existing services—can best be designated as Liberal-Conservative. That is, while he is, as all ritualists must be, fully alive to many points upon which our services might have been, without injury to their intrinsic simplicity and practical use, more diversified, he is yet satisfied that the best and wisest course, in the present condition of matters all around, is to leave them as they are, relying upon the elasticity which they already possess within the four corners of the Act of Uniformity, rightly comprehended, to meet the newly-evoked craving after less stiff, pompous, and lengthy worship than our churches have hitherto too much offered to their congregations. This elasticity, true to his proposition, he seeks in the historical elements out of which the present services grew up. For example, the call is for shorter and more frequent occasions of worship. Mr. Freeman sympathises with this demand, but remarks that our Morning Prayer down to the close of the Te Deum broadly represents the older Matins; while from the Second Lesson commences a fusion of Lauds and Prime. Why not then make, he asks, a substantive pause, ring the bell, if it may be, after the First Lesson, and let one congregation go out, and another come in, if it so list; while those whose time or whose zeal prompts them to stop for both offices are, of course, recommended so to do? So, in the evening, a similar break would designate Vespers and Compline. The Rubric and the Act of Uniformity combine to sanction this, for neither of them has one word in reference to the length of breathing time between the different portions of the service. Or, again, the still simpler expedient, and which we rather lean to, would be to make the chief break after the Third Collect, when the majority of the congregation would often retire; those who could not compass the commencement having quietly dropped in and remained to the end, together with the more devout and leisurely class who are expected to remain from first to last. Then, too, that right of ordering the separate use of the Litany, which the rubric has for three centuries ascribed to the Ordinary, and of which our Bishops are now beginning to avail themselves, contributes another element towards the supply of shorter and more varied methods of worship. Again, upon non-Sunday festivals, at least, the Eucharist affords another time and form of worship,

which persons to whom daily church-going is impossible may yet arrange their time for. The distribution of Sunday services would, of course, follow a similar principle. With this observation we drop the point, as its investigation would, from the importance of the questions raised, lead us on too far. The question of furnishing some supplementary forms of service for particular occasions stands, as Mr. Freeman observes, upon a footing different from the abridgement for daily use of the actual service. Usage has sanctioned a lax dealing with the Act of Uniformity in the two particular cases of consecrating churches, and State occasions of grief or joy. That the daily service shall stand intact, is what Mr. Freeman claims, while he urges that in its use it shall be handled in a liberal and intelligent spirit.

Our author does not, of course, while making his suggestions as to the bisection of the existing Matins and Evensong, imply that this course would provide in either half the best conceivable form of shorter service; one would present a strangely abrupt ending, the other a commencement even more bald. But with the doctrine of an unaltered daily service, it becomes, in his eyes, the only possible expedient, and so appears removed beyond the sphere of criticism. The alternative plan of stopping at the Third Collect, makes the previous semi-service more complete; the second, of course, still less so; but we should reiterate that its commencement must be left variable, in the accidental moment of the worshipper's entrance.

After much and anxious consideration of the whole question, we are ourselves inclined to accept the conclusion, that as things now are, the Prayer-book had better not be interfered with.

We take up this ground for the simple reason, that we fear any present attempt to alter it might be fully as likely to end in leaving it worse than it was before, as in bettering it. We are, therefore, content to keep it as it is. Our warrant for these apprehensions is to be found in the prevailing ignorance of the true nature of our services even in well-disposed quarters, and the consequent temerity of many of the suggestions which have emanated from friends. If we add to this the strong and active party which wishes to alter the Prayer-book, in order to eliminate its Catholic teaching more or less completely, we shall hardly fail to fall back upon the conclusion, *Μὴ κινεῖς Καμπύραν, at present*,—this is all we say; what may be possible and desirable in a later and better-instructed generation is a perfectly different matter, and one which Mr. Freeman has not touched, any more than we desire to handle it.

In confirmation of this view we shall allude, though only for a moment, to the debates which took place this year in the

Convention of Canterbury upon Prayer-book reform. We should imagine that there was but one opinion outside upon these discussions, namely, that the question was not ripe for being debated in an unreformed Convocation, and that the body in question was far from qualified, owing to its being unreformed, for settling the question authoritatively.

These debates were no sooner made public than, as might have been anticipated, they created a whole flight of amateur suggestions for the reform of the services, studding the Church newspapers, among which one letter in the 'Guardian' particularly attracted our attention, from its signature of initials and general tone connecting it with a clergyman of exemplary zeal and orthodoxy, whose church is a quotation through England for the heartiness and correctness with which its services—pitched at the key of daily service, and Sunday and festival communions—are carried on. And yet in this letter, coming from such a quarter, the proposal was made to shorten the week-day Matins by the omission of the time-honoured invitatory 95th Psalm—a psalm whose use in that place connects our service, as Mr. Freeman has shown, not only with the universal Church from probably the very earliest ages, but not impossibly with the antecedent Temple worship. No doctrine would, of course, be involved in the omission; but still there was reason to tremble for Prayer-book reform, when we saw a suggestion from an eminently friendly source, to deal so cheaply with an element of the service resting upon such venerable tradition.

But we can bring forward a still stronger and more strange example of the *cacoethes reformandi*, where antecedently we should have least expected to find its diagnostics.

During the course of last year, an article appeared in the editorial columns of the 'Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal,' and therefore speaking the authoritative sentiments of that learned and generally safe periodical, urging the alteration of the Prayer-book, as for other reasons, so in order to get rid of the 'wearisome' lessons out of the Apocrypha. Our readers will not have forgotten that some conversation lately arose upon this very subject in the Upper House of Convocation, in reference to which, as we have every reason for believing, the mistake of the reporters put sentiments into the mouth of one of our most able and active prelates which he was far from having uttered. The cry of 'Put out the Apocrypha,' is one which by its very nature commends itself to the indolence and the ignorance of persons of all schools; it is so obviously a tub for the whale of ultra-Protestantism. Even good Churchmen can so naturally beguile themselves with the argument, that as no more than a certain number of lessons are

numerically admissible per annum, these had better be selected from the best sources canonical, than the second-best Apocryphal, Scripture. And thus an assault upon the Apocrypha from the legionaries of the 'Record' and Lord Shaftesbury, feebly defended, if not abandoned by some at least of sound Churchmen, is far from a visionary anticipation of what may follow from a premature attempt to change the appointed services. We should have hardly thought it necessary some time back to point out to that class of readers with whom our words are likely to have weight, why the excision of the Apocryphal lessons would point to and make the way easy for a great deal more than that one alteration. But, with the example of our northern contemporary before us, we are unable to act upon this comfortable conviction.

The omission cannot be pressed from any literary or moral shortcomings to be found in the chapters which our Church appoints to be read; for no one will fail to deny the great beauty of the whole—the supereminent dignity, and withal practical value, of chapters like several of Tobit, the entire Book of Wisdom,—a composition standing among the small first class of universal literature, in the mere aspect of eloquent diction, its subject-matter apart,—and many portions of Ecclesiasticus. It would remain a simple concession to that mere ignorant bibliolatræ, which in other communities, dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has reached its legitimate limit of the abolition of all set forms of worship.

The Apocrypha does not rank with canonical Scripture—granted; but if on that account we are bound to remove it from our order of daily service, we shall have very little indeed left to say in behalf of the retention of the *Te Deum*, or of the three Creeds themselves, none of them pretending to belong to the canonical writings. The *Benedicite* would of course go, for it would be absurd to say that it was wrong to read the Apocrypha as a lesson, and right to sing it as a canticle.

The truth is, that while persons are very ready to describe the Apocrypha by negatives, as not canonical Scripture, 'not applied to establish any doctrine,' and so forth, they are very unwilling or very incapable of describing what it is,—a body of writings of extreme, unknown antiquity, constantly quoted by holy Fathers, valued by the Christian Church of all ages, whose very excess of respect towards it in so many of its branches is the proof of how high must be its real legitimate standing in the catalogue of sacred documents,—a body of writings, in the words of the same Sixth Article, which 'the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners,' and out of which, accordingly, the Lessons are half chosen for a small por-

tion of the year, in the proportion (besides a few special Lessons upon some saints' days) of *less than a twelfth* of the entire whole, of less than a sixth of the number of Old Testament lessons. Let any Churchman, imbued with reverence for Christian antiquity, who desires the change, boldly come forward and say that our Church did wrong in selecting, at her revision of the daily services, this proportion of lessons from books so precious to all pious minds, next to the canonical writings, and which, without such public provision, would probably, from the neglect of private readers, never have gained their due standing in the vernacular comprehension. Let him say that the Church of England, when she translated them, together with the other Scriptures, did not mean them to vindicate that very standing, or let him prove that they could ever have retained it by simply being printed in the Bible without being ever read in the congregation—let him prove either one or other of these positions, we say, and then we will listen patiently to his arguments.

But we state distinctly, that no man who claims to hold Church principles has a right, in the present temper of so many minds, to advise the retrenchment of the Apocryphal lessons, unless he be prepared to say that the Church of England was wrong at first when she appointed them; and while we should respect the honesty of this position, we should vehemently protest against its truth. It would be idle for any one to plead that he only meant to say there were too many such lessons, that a month's selection, for instance, would have been sufficient. Of course, the Church of England might have given only a month's length of lessons; but she might equally have made the Apocryphal season two months and a half, by throwing in the two Books of Maccabees. She has done neither, and so the attempt to alter her existing system in this respect is nothing else than a wanton assault upon that respect for Catholic tradition which, potent as it may be in our formularies, is assuredly not, from its popular excess, the prevalent vice of general England. It would be a wanton endeavour to sever an existing link between our services and those of all the whole residuary Church, and thereby bring us nearer to the sects which, while they reject the Apocrypha, revile also the Sacraments, and disbelieve the ministerial commission.

But we have been losing sight of Mr. Freeman in this digression, which we trust our readers will not think out of place, whenever a journal devoted to Church principles ventures upon so dangerous a topic as the revision of the Prayer-book; in order to the expulsion of the deutero-canonical books. We have, it will be seen, confined our illustration of the peril of starting, as things

are, the reformation of the existing services, to suggestions emanating from friendly and orthodox quarters. Of course, our argument from the so-called evangelical schemes of alteration, would be one of million-fold cumulation. But we give our readers credit for being acquainted with at least their general nature, and the briefest analysis of them to be intelligible would hurry us far beyond our prescribed topics. It is well known that the more restless and intelligent of the party of which Lord Shaftesbury is the representative, and the 'Record' the organ, feel that the Prayer-book is against them, and long, accordingly—whether or not they dare themselves to strike the blow—to pull it down.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's significant expression, used in the trouble-year 1851, to oppose some over-enthusiastic movement, that in consequence of such excess the alteration of the Prayer-book was '*further removed than ever*,' is not, we trust, forgotten. These words could have but one purport—the wish, more or less strong, for some revision; in which direction it were needless for us to point out. The 'Christian Times,' more outspoken than the 'Record,' is the regular organ for the letters, proposals, and meetings towards this end; and the now happily disinfected Religious Worship Bill of the last session, due to Mr. Kinnaird and Lord Shaftesbury, was, nobody doubts, intended in its first and most insidiously dangerous aspect, to enable that party to attain their object of a Puritanised Prayer-book by the short cut of free churches and a free ritual, like those of Sir Culling Eardley and Mr. Eddowes Gladstone, to be organised under the false pretences of undiminished allegiance to the Established Church.

And from another political agitator, the fussy Mr. Heywood, an indication, noways obscure, of the same propensity to meddle was given in the preceding session, in the republication, as a Blue Book, of the proposed revision of the Services by Tillotson and his party, so happily frustrated in 1689, and till 1854 lying obscure and forgotten in MS. upon the shelves at Lambeth. These suggested changes, flatulent and dull as they are, have been already embodied in, we believe, more than one edition of the Prayer-book, as it might have been. This same Mr. Heywood has given notice of a motion for next session upon the authorized version of the Bible.

Upon these practical considerations, combined with our real gratitude for, and our genuine admiration of our Prayer-book as it exists, and not from any vague optimism about its composition, as if, consistently with its own avowed purposes, it could not be amended in the right direction, we accept the conclusion that as things are, our services had better be left unaltered.

The least agreeable portion of our task has now to be en-

countered—the pointing out what seem to us deficiencies in the treatment of his topics by Mr. Freeman, or oversight in occupying the area of ground from which he has selected those topics. A work like his cannot, of course, be expected to be equally complete in all its departments, and what we have already said is enough to show that the exceptions which we shall have occasion to take are founded upon no captious or inimical feeling.

The chief, and we must in candour say, very unaccountable, shortcoming of the present volume, is the summary dismissal in about two-thirds of a page (378-9), of no less important a portion of our services than the Litany—a brevity the more remarkable, because in the introductory chapter, 'the general structure of our Morning and Evening services, and of the *'Litany,'* is mentioned as the first of the 'chief points' on which Mr. Freeman desires to clear popular conceptions. Perhaps, although he does not say so, he means to speak of it at greater length in his subsequent volume. If this be so, here is the reason; but if not, we have a right to protest against a share of attention so inadequate, in proportion to the fulness of all other topics, having been bestowed upon what is not so much a portion of the strictly termed daily service, as a substantive form of minor worship, parallel to, but independent of, and differently derived from, the services of morning and evening worship, founded as they are upon the psalmody of the Jewish polity. The latter was mostly a stationary service in the Temple—certainly it is such in the Church—while Litanies, as every student of Church antiquity knows, are connected with processions about the town, or about the church, not necessarily of course, but still very intimately. Again, their whole form and framework, and the parts which the Coryphæus and the congregations respectively play, although closely affianced to the responsory portions of the services, are marked by strong individual peculiarities not belonging to the latter, and such as necessarily become of special moment when they grow to be the informing spirit of the whole entire service. Another broad distinction, of course, is, that the Litany knows no distinction of morning or evening, nocturn or day hour.

The Litany question, again, assumes a fresh importance when we recollect that while, as we have seen, the Breviary offices and, more or less, their Greek correlatives are, as a matter of congregational use, extinct throughout the rest of the Western and the Eastern Church—we remaining, in Mr. Freeman's strong language, in this respect, 'the heirs of the world,'—yet the Litanies at least of the Roman Church are alive and vigorous, and daily becoming

more and more popular vernacular. Again (a remarkable coincidence), not only does the Litany of our English Prayer-book maintain its like hold of popular feeling, but, more than that, it has within, we may say, this very year, now for the first time since the Reformation, taken up a position it never held before, in the permission, implied or expressed, which our whole actual episcopate has given, or allowed to be taken, to use it as a separate service, on all days and at all hours, and not on the forenoons merely of three days in the week.

These things being duly considered, we repeat, that a work upon the principles of Divine service, for the use of the English Church in 1855, should deal fearlessly, largely, and at length, with the Litany question in all its phases through the universal Church. The very admiration for the *service* species of minor worship, which is Mr. Freeman's characteristic, should make him the more anxious to analyse that other one which appears in the present subjective works of all religions, not wholly unlikely to become, for good, or for evil, the winning cause,—the favourite minor service of the future, in the English as in the Roman Church. It *has* become so, popularly, in the latter—will it, and ought it to be the same in the Church of England? Will it, and ought it to supersede Matins and Evensong with their treasures of psalmody and Scripture? This is a matter Mr. Freeman is bound to face.

Again, we should have desired something more full than the transitory and merely referential allusion given in page 396 to a question among the most interesting of the ritual problems of the day, and one peculiarly within the field of Mr. Freeman's self-allotted scope in his present volume—the scope, we mean, of proving the plasticity of the English ritual, and its sufficiency, practically viewed, in setting forth the Catholic requirements of the lesser worship—we mean the well-known rubric:—

‘In quires and places where they sing, here followeth the anthem.’

This portion of the service has indeed been strangely overlooked by our writer—to such an extent that in the tabulated comparative view of the ‘Ancient English offices,’ and the ‘Revised office,’ given in pp. 288, 289, while the Anthem is recapitulated (out of its place, for the sake of comparison, according to Mr. Freeman's scheme in several instances), under ‘Morning Prayer,’ this portion of the service has been quite forgotten in the tabulation of ‘Evening Prayer.’ And yet the ‘Anthem’ has more than one aspect of interest to Mr. Freeman's inquiry. We need not say that there are two interpretations of this rubric current among those clergymen who make the revival of ritual

correctness their object. One class interprets 'anthem' etymologically, to signify that they are to sing a prose anthem, and nothing but an anthem; *i. e.* an antiphon, of which term anthem is merely the vernacular rendering, just as much as 'compline' is the same word as 'completorium,' and as 'surplice' is only the English form of 'superpellicium,'—a fact, the overlooking which by the good-humoured Dr. Bayford caused no small laughter in Doctors' Commons last summer, when he urged as an extreme case out of Lyndwood that the clergy might soon be called on to wear a *superpellicium*.

Another class accepts the word in a more comprehensive sense, as legalising the use of metrical hymns and portions of the verse psalms, (some, indeed, of the old antiphons having been metrical,)—a view in which they are backed by the old-fashioned parochial custom, though not ordinarily in that part of the service, of intercalating the read service of churches with selected passages of Tate and Brady. Accordingly, while the first class has it in its power to revive the capitulum, if not the antiphon itself, though not in its ancient place, the second has also found means to revive that olden variety of festal and ferial hymn, of which the loss (otherwise) is most undoubtedly (although Mr. Freeman has overlooked this branch of the subject) one of the things most to be regretted in our actual services.

Now, then, we assert that our author ought, in compliance with his own scheme, to have moderated between these two views, or at least to have attended to both, and to have pointed out the different hue which either custom casts upon the whole accompanying service. Both ways involve the retention of a feature of the earlier services, which otherwise had perished; a feature in either case the loss of which Mr. Freeman has regretted, while earnestly and loyally pleading that the compensating advantages of our actual vernacular ritual should check our viewing those retrenchments with bitterness or discontent. Now, then, we ought to be told whether in this place the antiphon alone shall exist of right (of *this* there is no doubt), or whether also under the term, the hymnology of the Christian psalmists, such as Ambrose, Hilary, and Prudentius, can live for English congregations in the English tongue. This, to speak generally, is the one only portion of the ordinary Matins and Evensong left to private judgment in the daily choice, and therefore to guide that choice we need peculiarly 'principles of Divine service.'

¹ Mr. Freeman alludes to the liberty of choice existing in the introductory sentences, to give the service its colour within *their* limits, according to the season; we wonder that this view did not lead him to discuss the present still broader field of freedom.

We are more intent on pressing this point, because our author will have the opportunity of remedying the oversight in his second volume, in connexion with the subject of introits, which he will of course handle. This 'anthem,' we need hardly point out, may become the introit also, on days when the Holy Communion is celebrated, in churches where the Litany is said as a separate service, and the Prayer of S. Chrysostom and the Benedictory Capitulum are not affixed to the Third Collect. Again, this consideration involves the question of such affixing, without which the *Tierce* element leaves Matins altogether, and coheres merely to the Litany.

But to proceed to a more general consideration. It will be observed that Mr. Freeman deals exclusively with the Sarum Breviary, terming it the Old English Office; and such no doubt it was in the main, being in use not merely over the large majority of the dioceses of the southern province, but in the diocese of Durham, and throughout Ireland. But still the York use was of sufficient dignity to merit at least some allusion, and for us to be told whether or not it had contributed to the actual Prayer-book. And here we take the opportunity of saying that it will be the fault of the public interested in ritual antiquities if this York Breviary much longer remains the very scarce tome which it now is, since some members of the Committee of the Ecclesiological Society, while lately examining the MSS. in Sion College Library, noticed, to their surprise, that a portly volume, which had hitherto been entered in the catalogue under that convenient mask for ignorance, the name of Missal, was nothing else than a York Breviary in a condition for the most part of excellent preservation.

Desirous as Mr. Freeman is to exhibit his subject as a being of life, with the colours and the contour of animated existence, rather than a dry anatomical specimen, shrivelled and sapless, as was too much the wont of other ritualists, we desiderate more precise references to that 'where,' upon which so much depends the 'how,'—and not the 'how' only, but also the 'reason why,'—of all acts of ceremonial worship. To be a ritualist, as Mr. Freeman justly comprehends the appellation, it is indispensable to be an ecclesiologist—to realize the *locale* of the whole service, and the changeful attitudes which its successive portions demand, no less than its literary transition of psalm and lection, responsory, creed, and prayer. Without this appreciation, the simple majesty of our own Prayer-book, or the gorgeous magnificence of the older services, comes before us with no other embodiment than that of a private recitation, be it by one or many clerks. To realize the service, we must add the action, and then the

choir of clerks, duly installed, duly vested, with the altar beyond, and to their west the multitudinous congregation of lay worshippers all come to life, as the ideal of the older, the actuality of the newer service. It irradiates the latter, it brings to the proof the former, phase of common worship. It enables us, in part at least, to unravel that web of mutual action and reaction which has tended to shape this as all other sublunary things. Words without forms are as lifeless as forms without words. We read of psalms and antiphons; we ponder our author's meditations upon the actual advantage of the latter in giving the key to the understanding of the psalms which they annotate. How much more intelligently can we do all this when we figure to ourselves the whole body of clerks singing the successive psalms in their stalls, the 'rulers of the choir,' at the tall lectern in the middle, out sounding the antiphon, in a position and with gestures expressive of that dominance over the whole psalmody, which, in theory at all events, the antiphon was intended to imply.

To take another instance. What a confirmation of the congregational origin of Church services is afforded by the mediæval custom of saying the nocturn lessons from the *Jube*—the gallery dividing the nave from the choir, and so named as the seat of the 'bidden' blessing—viz. for the benefit of that imaginary lay congregation in the nave which still existed in form, just as in form the witnesses for many ages stood outside the law-courts, awaiting the 'O yes!' of the official cryer.

So much for ecclesiology, specifically so called,¹ in illustration of Mr. Freeman's main argument in reference to the lesser worship. We need not point out its value *à fortiori* as fixing the signification of the more holy Eucharist. Accordingly we press upon Mr. Freeman to make ecclesiology an element in the future portion of his work, as it is not in the volume already before the world.

Two questions (or perhaps we should rather say two aspects of one great question), on which Mr. Freeman has spoken with deep feeling and with strong conviction, we reserve for the last; they stand by themselves, and indeed rather belong to the promised second volume, in which, without doubt, they will be more amply handled than in the present one; and the readers of the actual treatise can perfectly agree or disagree with Mr. Freeman's principles of daily service, without accepting, or the contrary, his views upon those subjects. We mean the decided repudiation of daily Eucharists, and of non-communicant 'assist-

¹ We do not admit this specific meaning as a sufficient one of the word, which properly includes ritualism also.

ance,'—questions whose delicacy we need not enlarge upon, and about which (why should we not speak openly?) there is a manifest risk of a tone of feeling growing up in our communion out of the newly-awakened appreciation of eucharistic blessings and responsibilities, somewhat akin, in the English Church, to 'Oratorianism' in the Church of Rome, the different *point de départ* in either case being duly apprehended. This tone of feeling is what is currently—too often most vaguely and ignorantly, at times justly and intelligently—termed *Romanizing*; not that the Eastern Church is not practically at one with Rome upon the question,¹ but because the existence of such feelings is too often the prelude or the accompaniment of that condition of discontent with the English Church, which, by the moral impossibility of any other result, has always ended in secession to the Roman Communion, even in the case of Mr. William Palmer of Magdalene himself. But into the *Romish* (we use this form of adjective advisedly, to include both the Roman views held by Roman Catholics, and the Romanizing views held by some Anglicans) aspect of the question another element of feeling has entered, and colours the whole. This is the substitution qua every laic, aye and every clerk also (in his own personal character) of dependence upon some personal priest as the pole-star of action, in lieu of the obligation of corporate duties, on his part, as a Christian baptized and Eucharist-fed—and maybe ordained—to all the Universal Church, and so in his own place to each of its many members. This substitution underlies the whole question. The primitive idea of assisting at a Eucharist, was that of taking part in a corporate action, the vestiges of which mode of feeling survived, as Mr. Freeman proves, by several interesting quotations, until deep in the Middle Ages. The new Roman rule excludes the congregational aspect altogether, as a principle. However many persons may happen at once to assist, each deals, as it were, by himself with the celebrant. But his isolation does not stop here. The new-school Romanist (for of him we are speaking; in proportion as he is not new-school, he has less deflected from the primitive standard) is not even his own master as to how often he shall communicate, how often merely assist. His director is the supervisor of all these things. The parish priest, or the priest whoever he may be, who is celebrating the mass which he is attending, has merely to celebrate; his field is the sanctuary and the altar. The reason of any one

¹ In the East, as is well known, there can be only *one* celebration a day in each church, as there is but one altar. But there the churches are grouped together at cathedrals and monasteries, so as, in fact, to be identical with the *chapels* under the roof of a Western church.

communicating or not, is not within his scope, unless he may be that person's director.

Of course this is only one side of the history. The gradual sloughing off of the vernacular character of worship, while all Europe was framing its languages and its civilization, on the one side, and on the other Rome and Constantinople wilfully shut their eyes to the phenomenon, had of course a great deal to say to the matter,—nay, so to speak, had made the system before the idea of a spiritual director had been developed in its actual proportions. Still, in so complex an affair, all component elements are of value; all act, and all react upon each other. Their composite result, as we see, is the Roman system of 'masses.' Against that system, as it is, we protest, while we uphold the Eucharist of Cyprian and Ambrose, of Augustine and Chrysostom. It has further aspects, also, into which we do not enter, for fear of swelling this article into a volume. Our purpose is, the ritual features of the question.

We protest, along with the communion to which we belong, against the system, on the part of the priests, of multiplied masses, said without a reference to congregational cooperation, *i. e.* communion; and on that of the laity, of their necessary public worship being reduced to a presence at one of these short actions, without of necessity *communion*; without, on the part even of communicants, of community of worship, through conjoint or responsive utterance of even one word of the appointed ritual. The system is bad in both its aspects; it weakens the obligation upon all Christian men of frequent communion; it lowers equally the obligation of common worship, through a mutilated use of higher worship being substituted for the complete one of the lower form.

Accordingly, as Mr. Freeman has pointed out, the Church of England alone, of all the Churches of the world, retains *three* as the minimum allowable number of communions in the year to justify in *her* eyes the claim, on the part of her children, to Church-membership; while in the communion of multiplied masses, one single communion annually is all that is absolutely required. At the same time we should be wilfully shutting our eyes to our own position, if we endeavoured to persuade either ourselves or others that, as a fact, our people at all lived up to these requirements. The contrary we know, unhappily, to be the case. How far, with their laxer rule, the continental Churches are able to show a fuller correspondence between theory and practice, we are unable to say. But we suppose that a census (were such practicable) would show very different results, in different portions of the Roman fold,—the

Tyrol, for instance, and Paris. And nowhere, we dare to assume, would the figures prove that Rome (or we should rather say *Religion*) had *gained* anything by the difference. We assume that a system which could, with tolerable success, bring its numerical majority to the altar once a-year, would, with very little more trouble, on the part of the clergy, do so thrice, or at the least claim and try to do so, without thereby letting slip that portion of the flock who equally under this system, and under the actual one, might only consent to communicate once, or it might be twice a-year. This is, after all, the fair, because the moderate, way of viewing the matter. The Roman plan seems at first sight, from its very laxity, to be the preferable one in these latter days of blasphemy and wide-spreading irreligion. But a little further reflection, similar to that which we have indicated, brings us back to the conclusion that the theoretical and the practical do herein combine in the conclusion that our rule is, and by the nature of things must be, the better system. Neither of them can, except by an unreasoning optimist, be held to have hitherto succeeded in practice. Neither London nor Paris, we know, can really be viewed as a city of communicants. Results must be looked for in the future; and the question, therefore, for us to deal with is the simple one, of whether we of England are prepared to maintain the triple obligation, or to take up the single one, and try to make that real and universal?

It would, of course, be unjust for us in urging this to refuse to do justice to Rome for the increase of communion among her members, which we honestly believe to have taken place in late days compared with the last century—in the three last centuries, according to many modern writers of that Church, compared with the Middle Ages, an assertion in warrant of which they have the curious historical fact, that one of the popular grievances which led to the great Roman Catholic rising of the North of England in Elizabeth's time, was the more stringent obligation of communicating thrice a year. Dr. Brownson goes so far in a recent number of his Review as to assert that it was an unusual thing for a lay person from the 8th or 9th (we forget which he says) century to the 16th, to have even once communicated in the course of his or her whole life! We cannot give credence to such a statement; but if it were true, *what* system does it condemn? Any one of the least fairness or comprehension, and not blinded by party, must answer—It condemns the system which set up non-communicant assistance at mass, in lieu of communicating, as the ordinary highest aim of lay Christian worship.

All these considerations, and many more which we could urge did we not fear to transgress our limits, are illustrative, from the present condition of the world, of the *à priori* probability of Mr. Freeman's assertion (resting in his mind not on such considerations, but upon the evidences of primitive writers) that in the earliest days of the Church the numerical multiplication of Eucharists was not the end aimed at, but that the Holy Ordinance was with them a matter of festal, though perpetually occurring observance. We may assume with him, without further discussion, that the Church of England ought not to aim at Roman frequency in her Eucharists. The obligation of conserving their congregational and communicant character alone precludes this, although she might relax her rule so far as, along with the reformed Catholic Communion of Scotland, to admit of celebrations with only one communion—a rule which, we believe, works well across the Border.

But the further question still remains untouched, of whether the order at all of daily celebration in any locality and under any circumstances is one to be struck out of our roll of pious aspirations for the English Church in future days of renovated vigour?

Towards solving this another consideration comes in, which we have hitherto kept out of sight; it is, whether the greater comparative dignity of one *Church* above another be not *ejusdem generis* with the greater comparative dignity of one day above another. The Episcopate, the Eucharist, the lesser service too, (this we dare along with Mr. Freeman assume,) were all from the beginning, but the upper chamber was the earliest seat of the two first; the borrowed Temple served for the third. With the temporal peace and prosperity of the Church came in alike the more varied services of the second period, and the Basilica, as the home of their celebration. This consideration, as we have previously pointed out, has not been adequately insisted on by our writer. Synchronising with this material change—although Mr. Freeman does not indicate the coincidence—was the introduction of daily Eucharists, yet *not* the masses, involving of course the presence of non-communicants, high or low, of modern Rome, and the actual Eastern Liturgies of similar aspect, but celebrations still congregational, still vernacular, where the Bishop was still the antistes, and the offertory of the elements was still the people's part.

The point then for us of the Reformed Church to face, is, whether this particular phase in the course of ritual transformation which marks the Church's history, was one of corruption, or a legitimate compliance with the altered attitude of the

kingdom of God towards the kingdoms of the world, enabling the rulers of the former, like prudent householders, to bring out new features of the mind of Christ as it stood revealed in His Holy Gospels.

We all are agreed that the burden of proof lies against daily Eucharists having been the practice of the Primitive Church. We are consequently agreed that our communion, in not enforcing them, has not betrayed her trust. We are all, in the third place, agreed, that the actual Roman system sets aside important features of the Apostolic Eucharist. The consideration we are to meet is thus limited to the one broad question: Does it seem conformable to Gospel Christianity (in spite of the example of primitive ages to the contrary) that the Christian Church should in its respective Dioceses maintain a daily congregational Eucharist, so that, as, according to the primitive idea, each diocese is in a sense the totality of the whole Church, the cathedral the one place of worship of the entire flock, as the one Bishop is the earthly representative of the Heavenly Pastor, so in each one day there should be at least one Eucharist, celebrated upon *one* altar, probably of the cathedral—but if in any other church, that church being *ex necessitate* the deputy of the cathedral, which all parish churches are, nothing more as they are nothing else—and the celebrant—equally *ex necessitate*—if not the Bishop himself, yet his special deputy, and officiating in virtue of that deputation?

So necessary is it in solving an ecclesiological question to take in all aspects of the matter. Mr. Freeman dwells too exclusively upon the more ritual consideration of the difference of *days*, and he overlooks the difference of Churches, a matter necessarily in the germ during the times of persecution. Accordingly he argues from there not having been daily Eucharists in those days of trouble and sectarianism, that they ought never to be. But neither, as we have seen, were there cathedrals, nor, at the first, special buildings set apart as churches. Let us then apply his argument rigorously to their existence, and what a more than Quakerish result we attain. On the same grounds again, how can we justify the Cassianic amplifications of primitive worship? In the Roman and Oriental communions, on the contrary, starting from the fall of the Western Empire, the growth of monachism, and the consequent creation of that splendid ex-crescence—splendid, we mean, in all æsthetic aspects—the mediæval monastic Church threw into discord the action of the one cathedral in its relation not only to that, but ('one string' having been 'untuned') to the parochial church likewise, and so contributed to the decay of primitive Eucharists.

But we have been all along assuming that there are Gospel indications of this frequency of Eucharists being according to the Mind of Christ. We are now bound to give our reasons. They are mainly contained in one text,—a text as familiar to us as any in Holy Scripture, as it is one of the most solemn and the most consolatory, and which is yet hardly appreciated in our communion as it ought to be, from our generally invaluable translation having unfortunately, in this instance, failed to render the full sense of all the words employed. 'Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι ΠΑΣΑΣ ΤΑΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. 'Ecce ego vobiscum sum *omnibus diebus*, usque ad consummationem sæculi;' in English, as it ought to be, 'Lo, I am with you *during all the days* until the consummation of finite time.' We are sure that no one who feels the force of the Greek will hesitate to say that *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας* has the full signification which S. Jerome gave it when he translated it '*omnibus diebus*,' and which can only be rendered into the vernacular, either from the Greek or the Latin, as '*during all the days*.' Our Authorized Version '*always*,' of course, covers a part of the meaning, but it is only a part; and this is one of the cases where incompleteness marches very near the confines of incorrectness. *Ἀεὶ* in Greek, *semper* in Latin, would adequately represent our '*always*;' that can, therefore, only stand as the translation of *ἀεὶ*. *Ἀεὶ* is *not* *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας* in the sense of this most blessed promise of the Saviour. The former implies, indeed, an eternity of presence, but it may be one cold, distant, impassive, the presence of an Epicurean or a Stoic deity. In *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας* we welcome the ever-watchful care of an Incarnate Lord, who guards each day our rising up and lying down again; who shields us in the noon-day heat, and drives away the midnight terror. And as the Church thus realizes the all-sufficing presence, *πας τὰς ἡμέρας*, so must she do *ἐκαστῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*—day by day—'until the consummation of finite time,' a term which she could not fail to connect with that of '*showing the Lord's death till He come*' (the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*), which is the very object of the Eucharist. Surely, then, with these two responsive texts before her, and with the eucharistic presence what it is, compared with any other condition of relationship between God and man, she could not have done wrongly in giving a eucharistic interpretation to the last solemn words of the earliest Gospel, as soon as her temporal condition enabled her to back her convictions by a corresponding action. As we have said above, the importation into the question of the principle of the oneness of the cathedral, and the resultant limitation of the obligatory number of daily Eucharists, would seem a sufficient preservation against the Roman oneness.

How, then, are we to apply these considerations to Mr. Freeman's position, and to the actual circumstances of the English Church? Viewing the matter practically as to the duty incumbent upon the Church in her length and breadth, in her crowded towns and sequestered villages, we fully subscribe to the wisdom of our author's conclusion :—

‘To this Apostolic standard, then, neither less nor more, broadly accepted, and acted on in its general spirit, I would fain urge the English Church to return. For doing so she stands, in one respect, at a singular and immeasurable advantage. It is this: that she has no need, in order to its full accomplishment, to alter an iota of her existing theory in the matter of ritual, but only to give practical effect to it: she has, though much to do, yet nothing to undo; no mutilated Sacrament to restore, no abandoned or abolished ordinary worship to recal. She need not change her course by a single point, but only

“Still bear up, and steer

Right onward.”

‘The theory of weekly Eucharist,—with tempered festival or other added celebration,—is significantly written for her, as indeed for Western Christendom generally, in her weekly-varying Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. The theory of twofold daily service, for the greatest possible number, is no less plainly written in her rubrics on that subject. And her practice, however defective, has all along tended, and tends increasingly at the present hour, towards the realization of these usages by means of her anciently derived Offices. Whatever of improvement or of growth has taken place, has been uniformly, or with exceptions which hardly call for notice, in this track and in this direction. All that is needed is, that she should set before her more definitely than ever, and as her fixed and unswerving aim, the recovery of the entire ritual condition of Apostolic days, by bringing back at least the bulk of her children to the great primeval practices of WEEKLY COMMUNION and DAILY COMMON PRAYER.’—Pp. 384, 385.

Well would it be for those who, like ourselves, from living in centres of activity, have become familiar with this condition of Christian life, to notice how far off the large bulk even of better-disposed and better-instructed Churchmen, both clergy and laity throughout the country, is from having reached this standard. The consideration would give a practical form to a vast amount of aimless energy now self-consuming. But still, as we have said, our reasoning would lead us to desire something more in the cathedral churches of the land; the exhibition, namely, of the Eucharist offering *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*. Such an alteration would, of course, involve a very different standard of cathedral duty to that which now prevails; but the upward advance would not be more marvellous, nor in reality (the State's interference apart) more difficult, than that which has, within the last twenty years, made so many parish churches the abiding places of the weekly communion and the daily service. How far, under the present condition of large dioceses, and until the Episcopate shall be very widely extended, the principal churches

of large towns, such as Leeds, Stafford, or Kidderminster, (to quote at random known centres of Church activity, possessed of churches of unusual dignity—churches which, according to the notions of an earlier century, would have been cathedrals,) might or might not attempt the same work as deputies of the cathedral, is a matter which each such church must decide upon for itself in concert with the cathedral, and which in no way affects the practical point in which we and Mr. Freeman are agreed. Even were daily Eucharists to be restored in the 'collegiate churches' of large towns, as such churches would then, of course, become, in fact, and doubtless so be styled, the condition of things existing in the Roman communion would not be hazarded.

We shall more briefly dismiss the question of non-communicant attendance during the celebration of the Holy Communion. We should be truly and deeply sorry to see the Roman system of assisting at mass take root here as at all equivalent to communicating. We have all seen, as was pointed out some years since in our pages, in an article on Oratorianism and Ecclesiology, the fruits of this system in the modern rite of benediction, which threatens to usurp the place almost of mass itself in the popular feelings of more advanced Romanists, and the principle of which is the effusion of increased blessing by the increased physical proximity of the consecrated host.

But is there no middle term between this system and the absolute expulsion of all non-communicants? Make weekly communion the rule of godly Christian life, and then the law of charity will come in to say that in this mixed world of ours, with each man the keeper of his own conscience, a latitude must be allowed to stay, and pray, and meditate, during the celebration of the Holy Communion, without participation being absolutely required on every such occasion. If this is denied, we do not see where we can stop short of such a literal restoration of the old public penitential system, as all, even while most fully subscribing to the language of the commination service, must own to be impossible. The primitive *expulsion* of non-communicants depended on this system for its reality. The modern English system of the great bulk of the congregation retiring uncommunicate is the growth of mere indifference. In a healthier state of things, we have but the choice of these two alternatives: a restoration of the old expulsion of non-communicants, or a continuance of the modern method of permitted retirement—with the stoppers, however, and the retirers assuming very different relative proportions from the tone of the many waxing warmer. The former course would compel all those, who, for whatever cause, did not mean to participate upon that day, to

leave the church before the consecration. The latter would connive at their remaining for the prayers and praises in which, as *communicants*, though not actually then and there *communicantes*, they could feel they had a partnership. We are yet to be persuaded that the primitive Church, could it be called together in council, to say what the attitude of the extant Church to the world allowed of deviation from its rule, would not applaud this charitable licence, so long as communion was upheld as the rule, assistance merely as the exception.

It is certain that the Church of England herself nowhere forbids the concession, a prohibition which she could have hardly failed to proclaim in the most express and stringent terms, had she meant at her Reformation to set up the exclusion, with the example before her eyes of her own antecedent latitude in the opposite excess.

The words with which the volume concludes deserve to be maturely taken to heart by all who, seeking for the things of God, have found love and trust in the well-being of the English Church.

‘Above all, these Offices have not been duly *used*. As services reaching through the whole of life, and so, in due subordination to Eucharistic service, guiding, moulding, and elevating it, they are to the far greater part of our clergy, much more to the mass of the laity, utterly strange. Solemnly bound though the former are, by their ordination vow, to the daily and continual use of them, and to bring others to them to the best of their power, it is but lately that any sense of these obligations has begun to be manifested among us.

‘The causes which have led to this state of things cannot here be inquired into. One fertile source of it, and which must continue to have the same result until the evil shall in God’s good time be remedied, is to be found in the strange and well-nigh incredible custom which has prevailed among us, and is only beginning in the rarest instances to be broken through, of our clergy being admitted to their holy office without a shadow of training in the duties, but specially in the *mind* and *habits* proper to it, and essential to the well-being of the Church. All, however, that it falls within the scope of this work to point out is, that the responsibility and shame of such neglect, in clergy and laity alike, is tenfold greater in the case of the English Church than of any other. First, because in no other have the public Offices of Ordinary Worship been so sedulously and completely popularised, and fitted for the use of all in whom a spark of love or faith survives; and next, because, though a faithful use of these services, beyond the example of other ages and lands, will abundantly justify that reduction of them from their old grandeur to their present simplicity, and from an ideal to a practicable standard, nothing short of this can possibly do so.’—Pp. 397, 398.

Many of our readers are probably aware that Mr. Freeman, in using these solemn words, does so with that reality of conviction which personal devotion creates. Hitherto he has been chiefly before the world under his own name as the promoter of what he here so warmly and so justly urges, Theological Colleges, both as

for many years the indefatigable Principal of that of Chichester, and as the author of a pamphlet upon the necessity of their general extension, which appeared a few years since, and, as it deserved, excited much and favourable attention. Since that time the necessity for such institutions has received public and authoritative sanction in the Third Report of the Cathedral Commissions, reviewed in our last number. We may, therefore, now begin to hope that the stone has practically been set rolling. Already the results of this report have shown themselves in the Diocese of Lichfield, where the scheme of such a College, for some time dormant, has been actively revived under the Bishop's personal supervision in consequence of that recommendation, which stands conspicuous in the fore front of the circulars. The antecedent institution of the College at Cuddesden, is a fact which must be familiar to all observers of Church progress. Of course, as Mr. Freeman says, we must in patience wait for the theological training of our clergy to become a general reality, before we can hope for that intelligent knowledge, and that faithful use of our appointed services, which can alone bring out their true meaning, and reap the full advantage of their manifold contents, and which alone, above all things, can justify the Church in contemplating their alteration.

But still, even under such heavy disadvantages, our own generation has already done much—marvellously much, if we compare the present year with no further back than 1830—towards bringing to light their long-forgotten significance, and making that significance in its practical use a thing of personal concern to our Church population. The very obloquy it has raised is the earnest of success. The perpetual dishonest carplings of the Puritan school—the mercenary mock-martyrdom of the Beals and the Westertons, tell the tale. Mr. Freeman has rather cut himself off from appreciating this form of growth, by his stoical exclusion throughout the volume of considerations based upon the doing as distinct from the saying of the services. The broad definitions have been laid down, in stones and wood, of Eucharist and services. For the former, in our new churches, the sanctuary has been made deep and well defined—for the latter, the Chancel, either stalled or benched stall-wise, for clerks and choir, has been apportioned in numberless churches, where 'extreme views' (whether what makes '*extremity*' be comprehended or not) would be feared and scouted. The lectern too for the lessons standing apart by the act of motion to and from it, visibly marks the different character of lections, and of prayer and praise. In another class again of churches, although these seemingly arrangements have not been compassed, yet the low side desk—with its one face not adverse to the Altar, for psalms and prayer, and

the other towards the people for scripture reading, indicates the same principles, though less intelligently. In a third class, again, though prayers and psalmody are said towards the people and from the altar, yet the seat of the officiator is no longer the offensive central pulpit of our younger days. All these facts of ecclesiology indicate a marvellously quickened appreciation of the 'Principles of Divine Service'—showing itself on the most natural side first—the side of *use* and not of *theory*. Buildings, enrichments, postures, action in short, are after all the books of the million, and from their attributes we can most surely appreciate the failure or the success of any movement. To this tangible trial we confidently entrust the Public Worship question in the Church of England,

NOTICES.

CANON HUTCHINSON'S 'Parish Recollections,' (Masters,) form a volume of sermons very far above the average in point of interest and practical utility. They witness to a Churchmanlike ministry, of the truest and most earnest kind, exercised for thirty-eight years in the same parish, by one 'who ne'er has changed, or' (apparently) 'wished to change his place.' Such a life is a link between a past phase of the English Church's vitality and the present one; and it is pleasant thus to learn that the old paths had, in some corners of the land at least, continued to be trodden, though for the most part the rank weeds of sloth and forgetfulness had grown over them. The sermons are on plain topics, the every-day interests of a Christian village in any age of the Church—Sundays and Services—funerals and marriage—Lent and Advent. But all through, we feel that we are reading real records of work,—work reaching to the very springs of human actions and feeling, though in a humbling and everyday sphere. A slight strain of melancholy pervades the volume in virtue of its topics; the tone throughout is that of warning: nor, indeed, were it otherwise, would it be so true to the needs of the period to which its voice was first addressed. The sermons 'On the Spirit of the Church's Daily Devotions,' and on the 'graves opened,' are noticeable, even in this volume, for depth and soundness of Church teaching. Others, bearing on schools, confirmations, &c., adapt it more especially for the reading of the young, and, we may add, of their teachers. The volume is remarkable as containing, by way of illustration, a drawing of the interior of Trentham Church, with its curious Jacobean high screen, furnished by the late Duchess Countess of Sutherland.

Mr. Henry Newland is not only what is called a practical man, but he is the instiller of the practical element into others. He introduces as the writer of a useful little tract, 'Cottage Economy,' (Masters,) a pupil teacher. In this valuable work the writer shows a village family at work: how far twelve shillings a-week will go, what it will do, and the exact point at which the pinch begins. All the criticism that we can pass upon the tract is, that it certainly does not overstate matters. What we fear is, that Westbourne is rather above the average both in wages and general economical advantages: for example, ninepence a pound is considerably above the price at which a single cottager could sell his pork. Nor is it possible always for the cottager to keep his pig: the temptation to pillage the farmers for pig meat is so strong, that many employers discourage the labourer's pig. The most useful part of the 'Cottage Economy' is the cooking department: but what a striking fact it is that after Mr. Newland had domesticated a dozen villagers with himself for six weeks to teach them the art of soups and stews, they all returned to the tea and bread-and-

butter dinners! We leave it to ethnologists to suggest why the Saxon race is incapable of learning cookery.

'A Sunday Book for the Young,' (Van Voorst,) is rather below the mark, both in style and illustration.

Mr. Goss's 'Manual of Marine Zoology,' (Van Voorst,) a subject becoming very popular, is an attempt, and, like all the author's, a successful one, to bring science down to common minds, without infringing on its accuracy or slurring over its unavoidable difficulties.

Two series of Manuals—one concerned with stone carving and one with gothic mouldings, (J. H. Parker,)—assume too much or too little on the part of those, actual workmen, to whom they are addressed. If stone carving is to be learned as a dead language, this is not the grammar of it; if it is to be taught as a living tongue, this is but a meagre course of literature.

'A List of Artificers in Church Work,' privately printed by the Northampton Society, has its uses: but in order not to seem partial, its compilers recommend, without discrimination, tradesmen and artists whose productions are as bad and as good as can be.

Waldegrave's 'Bampton Lectures' (Hamilton, Adams & Co.) are the most humiliating work we have recently met with. Not to the author, for he has done his best; but to 'the famous University' which appointed him to the high office which he discharged last year. We do not wish to speak so as to give pain to a respectable man; so in this case we must discharge a disagreeable duty in the most summary manner. In style, method, learning and argument the volume reflects great discredit on the University.

Mr. Amphlett has published a volume, which he calls 'A Key to the Revelations,' (Hamilton, Adams & Co.) a book which certainly does not exist in the sacred canon. This work begins with an appendix; and its confusion of manner is but a faint illustration of its matter. We speak deliberately when we say that publishers incur a serious responsibility in permitting the works of the insane to come before the public. There is not a single sentence in the volume which has any meaning at all. Here is one, which is by no means an exaggerated specimen of the unfortunate writer's state of mind:—

'The harlot, as Tamar, her first and second temples having died, as Ez
'and Onan, without producing literal, as the Temple's spiritual, and
'Christ's Spirit, as Shiloh, being withheld as spiritually from the Temple,
'she becomes as Tamar, literally, a spiritual adulteress, and her elder twin,
'as Tamar's, puts forth his hand, as Christ's select apostle, acknowledged
'by Him to be Cephas, the stone of Jacob's declaring; but as Zarah literally,
'so did Cephas spiritually, withdraw his hand into the womb of
'time, as of the harlot, to give spiritual birth to his younger brother and
'apostle, first in S. Paul, of Benjamin. Thus, as Tamar, the harlot, holds
'her enigma of Judah's Church, with his crozier and staff, and boasts
'herself, as being neither a widow nor a harlot, but sits as a queen, and
'sees no sorrow.'—P. 176.

We observe a marked improvement in Archidiaconal Charges. In abstaining from discussing doctrinal matters, the Archdeacons, we think, deserve well of the Clergy, and do much to make their office really more useful by circumscribing its limits. Archdeacon Hale, in his recent 'Charge,' (Rivingtons,) attempts the perilous and invidious thesis of showing that intramural burial is not injurious to the public health. He almost proves that the presence of corruption is rather a sanitary requisite than the contrary. Overstated as Mr. Hale's argument is, his Charge is replete with exceedingly curious research and interesting literature, most carefully compiled and of the highest interest. The two new Archdeacons of the diocese of Oxford, Archdeacon Bickersteth, in his 'Charge,' (Rivingtons.) and Archdeacon Randall, in his 'Charge,' (J. H. Parker,) have delivered sensible and useful addresses to their Clergy concerned with the practical topics of Education, Church Extension, Repairs, Bell-ringing, Church Rates, and the like.

'Saul of Tarsus,' a drama in five acts, by G. B. Paley, (Rivingtons,) has the merit of good intentions, but is neither poetry nor a drama.

'The Benefit of Christ's Death,' by Paleario, (Macmillan,) is the reprint of a work once extremely famous, and supposed to be lost, and which exerted an immense amount of influence at the time of the Reformation. It is edited by Mr. Churchill Babington, both in the original and in the contemporary translation, with great luxury of typography and carefulness and profusion of illustration; more so than the intrinsic merits of the treatise command.

The Archbishop of Dublin has published his 'Charge on the promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.' (J. W. Parker.) His Grace seems to desire a monopoly in his protests: he protests as much against other people's protests against this doctrine as he insists upon his own protest. In the present publication the Archbishop only quotes himself and the Cautions for the Times seven times; but then he quotes nobody else.

The work called 'Introduction to Theosophy,' (Kendrick,) is a curious sign. It is actually an attempt to revive the theosophy of Jacob Boehmen, and consists for the most part of tracts by the celebrated William Law, who it is well known adopted this strange pseudo-philosophy. The editor quietly asks for one hundred thousand pounds to found a Theosophic College, to which he offers to attach himself as first director. We recommend this work to Dr. Maitland, whose inquiries on magnetism we regret to find suspended. The present writer considers that magnetism, with its kindred developments of clairvoyance and Reichenbach's Odyle, are intended as spiritual aids for a further revelation and new outpouring of something more than ten Pentecostal gifts. Here he impinges on the Irvingite postulate. As far as we can understand this book, it professes to fuse Magianism, the latter Platonists, the Cabbalists, the Alchemists, the Oriental Metaphysics, the ascetic Christian divinity, and the mystical writers of various ages, Swedenborgianism, Hutchinsonianism, Oken, and the more recent Spirit-rapping, into a new 'Theosophic' system. Wild and monstrous as all this is, the volume is an extremely curious one; if in no other aspect,

as an illustration of a phase of the human mind not lightly to be regarded. The influence, said to be on the increase, of Mr. Aitkin's speculations, exhibits a cognate tendency.

Mr. Haskoll has published a 'History of France,' (Masters,) sound, useful, and compendious, which fills up a gap in our elementary literature. It is written with ease and spirit. We believe it to be an ascertained fact that the famous words, *Fils de S. Louis*, &c. were never uttered by the Abbé Edgeworth.

Mr. Wilberforce has published 'Seven Letters to the Editor of the 'Weekly Register, in reply to the Rev. F. Meyrick's Article on Church 'Authority,' (Burns & Lambert,) i. e. the article which appeared in our own pages on Mr. Wilberforce's recent book. Mr. Meyrick's article has been reprinted in a separate form by our own publishers, (Mozley,) and in an Appendix Mr. Meyrick deals with Mr. Wilberforce's reply. Although on either side somewhat severe language has been used, such seems inseparable from controversy; and on one occasion, at least, Mr. Meyrick has, we observe, withdrawn phrases which grated on a person whom to know was, and is, to respect.

'Our Christian Calling,' (Mozley,) is a plain and useful set of conversations on various subjects. It is something more than a tract, written at the same time with solidity and life.

Mr. Gilderdale's 'Prize Essay on the Home Duties of Christianity,' (Bell & Daldy,) is remarkable as the production of a young man. It consists of a thoughtful and ethical review of social duties, in the various relations of the Christian family and home, from which experience might learn many profitable lessons.

Mr. Lonsdale, the Secretary of the National Society, has printed, (J. W. Parker,) 'A Brief Exposition of the Parables.' It is intended for the use of Sunday-school teachers. Originality and fulness were not within the writer's scope, so that we do not complain that the work is only meagre. As far as it goes it is suitable.

In a very useful Convention Sermon, (Diocese of New Jersey,) preached by Mr. Stewart, of Newark, (Padney & Russell,) a single sentence arrests us. 'Children go to school for seven years on an average.' If this is so, and the preacher is not speaking of the richer classes, we can only say that education is much better cared for on the other side of the Atlantic than among ourselves.

The Librarian of Woburn Abbey, Mr. J. Martin, has translated, and a pretty monograph it makes, M. Guizot's Essay from the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 'The Married Life of Lady Rachel Russell,' (Bosworth.) The subject is a good one; and it is treated with great skill and delicacy by M. Guizot. The mention of the *Revue des deux Mondes* reminds us that a prospectus, written with considerable skill, announces a periodical of more than usual promise, of which the specialty is a newspaper, consisting only of Leading Articles and Criticism. We allude to the forthcoming 'Saturday Review.'

INDEX TO VOL. XXX.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Alfonso de' Liguori, St. [*The Glories of Mary, Month of Mary, &c.*], 417-467. Liguori the exponent of Roman Catholic teaching, 417, 418. Glories of Mary, 418. English edition, 420. Contents of, 421, 422. Its theological statements, 423-462. Its morality, 463. Its practical effects, 464-467.

C.

Cathedrals, the Future of English [*Reports of Commissioners, &c.*], 174-218. Commissioners' Reports, 174. Contents of, 175-183. Patronage, 183. Choral Service, 184. Christ Church, Oxford, 188, 189. Duties of the Chapter, 190. Education, 191. Fabric, 194. Property and augmentation of Vicarages, 197. Schedule of additional Sees, 200. Signs of progress, 210. In the Colonies and Scotland, &c. 211-218.

Clergy, Fiscal Burdens of the [*Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, &c.*], 48-81. Have the Clergy a right to common justice? 48. Special burdens of the Country Clergy, 49. As a corporate body the Clergy has its complaints, 50, 51. Rural tithes, 52. Grievances of beneficed Clergy, 53. Rates and taxes, &c. 54-56. Unfair assessments, &c. 57-60. Compulsory ecclesiastical payments, 61. Queen Anne's Bounty, 64. Parish rates, 65. Poor rates, 70. Other burdens, 71-81.

D.

Dogmatic Theology [*Bushnell's God in Christ, &c.*], 101-158. Dogma, 101. Alliance between faith and morals, 103. Sense of dogma, 103, 104. Had heathenism any dogmas? 108. Necessity of dogma, 106.

NO. XC.—N.S.

Dogma the frame-work of religion, 103, 100. The revolt against dogma, 110. Dr. Bushnell's Discourses, 111. Examination and criticism of, 112-158.

Donaldson, Dr. [*Liber Jasher, &c.*], 385-416. His Book of Jasher, 385. The author's skill in philology, 386. Argument of the book illustrated, 387, 388. Contents of the Book of Jasher, 389. Its construction, &c. 390, and contents, 391-410. Summary of Dr. Donaldson's views, 410, 411. His work a mere theory, 412. How possible with any belief in the Gospels? 413. Or in Old Testament? 414-416.

F.

Fellowships, Clerical and Lay [*Oxford University Reform, Papers on*], 150-173. Oxford University Reform, 150. Tenure of Fellowships, 160. Should Clerical Fellowships be abolished? 161; or exchanged? 162. The question of right, 164-172. Powers of dispensation given to Visitors, 173, 174.

Food, and its Adulterations [*Hassall's Sanitary Inquiry, &c., Parliamentary Papers, &c.*], 323-356. Life dependent on food, 329. Absorption, 330. Dependence on our fellow-creatures, 331, 332. English trading, 332. Accum, 333. The *Lancet* inquiry, 334. Evidence, 335. Adulteration of food, its theory and practice, 336-353. Attempts to palliate it, 354-356.

Freeman, Rev. P. [*The Principles of Divine Service, &c.*], 468-516. Distinction between the Eucharist and the Lesser Offices, 468. Character of the English Prayer-book, 469. How esteemed, 470. Its influence, 471. Commentators on, 472-474. Contents of Mr. Freeman's work, 475-505. The daily Eucharist, 506-512. Assistance of non-communicants, 513.

M M

H.

History, Divine Drama of [*Divine Drama, &c.* by Rev. J. Smith], 82—100. Is History a Drama? 82. Review of, and extracts from Mr. Smith's work, 83—96. The Church's position, 96, 97.

S.

Smith, Sydney [*Memoir of, &c., Life of, &c.*], 237—300. First impressions of his character, 237. Deficient in the spiritual element, 238, 239. Just, 239. His life, 260—263. Preferment at Foston, 264. Subsequent life, 265, 267. His politics, 268. Unsuitableness of his profession, 270. His aspect towards the Church, 271, 272. His sermons, 273. His style, 274. Miscellaneous extracts and criticisms, 277—297. Not a bishop, 298—301. Syriac Literature [*Bernstein's editions of Abul-farage, &c.*], 301—328. Abul-farage, 301. Editions of, 302—304. Contents of his work, 305. Life, 306. Extracts from his work, 307. Life continued, 307—310. Heterodox, 311, 312. His Syriac Chronicle, 313—328.

T.

Testament, the Greek [*Webster and Wilkinson's Edition of, &c.*], 219—225. The text,

219. Notes, 220. Method of interpretation, 221. Remarks on harmonies, 222. Questionable interpretation, 224, 225.

V.

Vernacular, Use of the [*Oratorian Prayer Book, &c.*], 337—384. Use of the Vernacular natural and sanctioned, 337; but not followe, 338; in the East, 339; in England, 360; in the Roman obedience, 360. Early Vernacular Versions, 362. The Danubian Provinces, 364. Rome in collision with the Vernacular, 366. How far in the West the use of the Vernacular obtains, 367—384.

W.

Women, Rights of [*Parker, Higginson, &c. on*], 1—47. Do Women feel their oppression? 1, 2. Mrs. Wollstonecraft, 3. The American cry for Woman's rights, 4. Convention of Syracuse, 5—10. Mr. Higginson's Summary, 11, 12. Mr. Parker, 14—16. Bertha and Lily, 17—25. How far the cry is right in America, 26—30; or in England, 31. Duties, Privileges, and Responsibilities of Women, 32—47.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JULY.—Mozley's Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination—Practical Sermons on the Characters of the Old Testament—Sermons, Lectures, &c. by Messrs. Cotton, Curteis, Fraser, Evans, Reichel, Puckle, Williams, Cowie, Robertson, Bishop Jackson, Kempe, Portal, Bishop of Oxford, Bishop of S. David's, Codd, Blunt—Occasional Sermons by Bishop of Lincoln, Edwards, A Country Rector, Brooking, Key, Spurgeon—Malan's Who is God in China?—Taylor's Interleaved Book—Annals of England—Hymnal for Use in the English Church—The Christian at Home—Moral Theology of the Church—Liber Cantabrigiensis—Chamberlain on the Holy Eucharist—Bishop of Brechin's Commentary on the Litany—Markland on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England—The Sisters—Archdeacon Williams's Charge—Brief History of Sherburn Hospital—Considerations upon the Presence of Non-Communicants at the Holy Communion—Credenda, Agenda, Postulanda—The World on the Thames—Wordsworth on Bunsen's Hippolytus—Lord Lyttelton on National Education—Scudamore on the Rule of Faith, &c.—Baines' Life of Archbishop Laud—Montgomery's Sanctuary—Bullock's Songs of the Church—Phillips on Prophecy in Relation to Mahometanism—Dr. Mill's Christian Advocate Publications—Archdeacon Hare's Vindication of

Luther—Treatise on the Holy Eucharist, &c.—Kingsley's Glaucus—War: the Perpetual War Manual, &c.—Wickes's Spires and Towers of Mediæval England—Denison's Lectures on Gothic Architecture—Gailhabaud's Architecture de Vme. au XVIII^{me}. Siècle, et les Arts qui en dependent—Turner's Letter on Reformatory Schools—Dr. Pusey's Treatise on the Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist—Charge of the Bishop of Bath and Wells—The Churchman's Library—Heygate's Manual—Greek Concordance to the Holy Bible, &c. &c.

OCTOBER.—Hutchinson's Parish Recollections—Newland's Cottage Economy—Sunday Book for the Young—Goss's Manual of Marine Zoology—Manuals of Carvings and Mouldings—List of Artificers in Church Work—Waldegrave's Bampton Lectures—Key to the Revelations—Archidiaconal Charges—Saul of Tarsus—Benefit of Christ's Death—Archbishop of Dublin's Charge—Introduction to Theosophy—Haskoll's History of France—Wilberforce's Seven Letters—Our Christian Calling—Gilderdale's Prize Essay—Lonsdale's Exposition of the Parables—Stewart's Convention Sermon—Married Life of Lady Rachel Russell.



